

The Coastal Erosion Task Force

A Report to the Governor



Prepared by:

Members of the Coastal Erosion Task Force

Sponsored by:

The Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development

Funded by:

The Department of Ecology

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>	3
<i>I. INTRODUCTION</i>	7
<i>II. RESOURCES AT ISSUE</i>	8
<i>III. NECESSARY ELEMENTS OF STATEWIDE COASTAL POLICY</i>	10
Regulatory Framework	10
Knowledge/Scientific Foundation	11
Fiscal Rationality/Equity/Responsibility	12
Long-Range Planning	12
<i>IV. INTERESTS OF THE TASK FORCE PARTICIPANTS</i>	15
Coastal Community/Local Government Interests	15
Specific Tribal Interests	16
Statewide Interests and State Agency Perspectives	17
Statewide Interests	17
State Agency Interests	17
Environmental Interests	18
Federal Interests	19
<i>V. GUIDANCE AND CRITERIA TO ADDRESS COASTAL PROCESSES</i>	20
Criteria For Successful Solutions	21
<i>VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	22
<i>VII. ISSUES REQUIRING RESOLUTION</i>	26
<i>VIII. SIGNATURE PAGES AND LETTERS OF SUPPORT</i>	28
<i>IX. MINORITY REPORT AND DISSENT</i>	40
Background	45
Specific Recommendations	46
Recommendations - State Funding Support	47
General Comments on the Task Force Report	48
Conclusion	49

APPENDIX I MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

APPENDIX II MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEETS

WASHINGTON COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1998, Governor Gary Locke directed the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development to create a Coastal Erosion Task Force. The Task Force's goal was to develop short and long-range policy recommendations on coastal processes.

This document should not be used as a regulatory document.

The following recommendations resulted from the Task Force and steering committee meetings:

1. Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of the state's natural resources and critical habitat; solutions should minimize interference with fishing areas and/or keep solution impacts to a minimum.
2. Dredged material should be managed as a resource and reused beneficially within the Columbia littoral cell. For example, dredged sand should remain within the active littoral zone.
3. The Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study should be completed. The federal, state, and local partners will establish roles and expectations among themselves.
4. Scientific studies of coastal processes along the southwest coast of Washington should examine the influence of the Columbia River system. These studies should also include an analysis of the effects and opportunity for mitigation of past interventions in coastal processes, particularly those related to navigation projects and engineering studies describing the effects of hard structures on high-energy shorelines.
5. Long-term scientific monitoring of the condition of southwest Washington ocean beaches, and the impacts and performance of past and proposed interventions to the system, should be a priority.
6. There should be an independent technical review of all state-funded coastal studies and analyses that will form a part of the technical foundation for long-term coastal planning, policy development, and/or proposed actions.
7. An assessment of coastal hazards, including predictions of future shoreline change rates, should be conducted.
8. An evaluation of socio-economic impacts of actions in the coastal zone should be conducted.
9. Policy and projects related to coastal erosion should be analyzed for their long-term costs and benefits.

10. In the long term, state and local governments must develop a policy of land management that:
 - acknowledges the natural processes of the ocean, and the potential conflicts with private property owners located in the erosion-hazard areas,
 - encourages and supports the work of local jurisdictions to protect life and property interests,
 - supports the efforts of governments and non-profit organizations to protect recreational opportunities and the natural qualities of the coast.
11. An inventory of local land use information should be undertaken to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies, should be included.
12. Federal, state, tribal and local jurisdictions could use the information gathered from the inventory to better understand how to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, particularly as it pertains to erosion-hazard areas.
13. State and local governments should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone.
14. As part of a comprehensive inventory, erosion-hazard zones should be mapped using available shoreline data and current best science. Such hazard zones may incorporate both accretion and erosion areas; and could identify: imminent, intermediate, and long-term erosion hazards.
15. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should work together to define coastal erosion-hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high-hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that mapping projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy.
16. The State should continue to provide technical and financial assistance to local jurisdictions, and tribal governments where applicable, to review and revise comprehensive plans, flood hazard management plans, and development regulations to discourage development in coastal erosion-hazard areas.
17. Local jurisdictions should develop new mechanisms, or re-enforce existing mechanisms, to warn those with property interests of the danger of building or buying in hazardous erosion areas.
18. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should recognize that effective coastal protection may have some economic consequences for coastal communities, and

should take steps to ameliorate these impacts through measures such as shared risk, buyout assistance, and others.

19. Local jurisdictions should develop long-term strategies to assess the location of critical, at-risk public infrastructure such as highways, water and sewer facilities, schools, etc., and private investments in light of coastal zone hazards. These might include threats from chronic hazards like long-term erosion.
20. Southwest Washington coastal communities should continue the development and analysis of alternative strategies to address current and long-term coastal erosion and accretion issues. Financial assistance from a variety of funding sources, including the state should be sought.
21. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should adopt the following guidance to address coastal processes (given the unique nature of tribal reservation land, not all criteria may apply to tribes).
 - A. New development in erosion hazard areas and recently accreted areas should be discouraged, based on assessment of risk.
 - B. Landowners should be expected to assume all risk if they knowingly buy and develop property (plat or place structures) in such an area.
 - C. New structural solutions to erosion problems should be discouraged when there is a potentially adverse impact to the natural conditions of the beach, habitat, public access, other recreational resources, long-term maintenance costs, and impact to adjacent properties. The spirit and intent of state laws discouraging armoring--such as sea walls, wave bumpers, rock revetments, and other types of hard structures--in favor of other alternatives that are more likely to preserve a dune/beach environment.
 - D. In rare circumstances, structural solutions should only be considered in situations where it has been determined that erosion is threatening critical public facilities such as bridges, major highways, sewage treatment plants, utility lines, and municipal water supplies.
 - E. The selection and implementation of any alternative should be based upon an analysis of effectiveness, impacts, risk, and cost compared to other alternatives within a long-term plan.
 - F. Maintenance and modification of existing navigation structures should be subject to the criteria for successful solutions outlined in Section V.
22. Public education, participation, and outreach are important to a wide perspective on the issues. While this is a primary responsibility of local, state, and tribal governments, there is an awareness of the need for the general public and non-

governmental organizations to participate in community education issues and recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in accomplishing this task.

WASHINGTON COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

Washington's coastal zone is a dynamic and ever-changing area. The natural cycle of erosion and accretion of land due to coastal processes continues. Increasing settlement and use of the coastal area result in complex issues requiring thoughtful balancing among the many competing interests.

Currently, southwest Washington's coastal and tribal communities are faced with mounting pressures resulting from increasing coastal erosion in some areas. Successfully addressing these challenges will require close cooperation among local, state, tribal, and federal agencies and clear communication with the public--not only in the affected areas, but also across the state.

In an attempt to address some of the issues, in 1998 Governor Gary Locke directed the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development to create a Coastal Erosion Task Force. Governor Locke's directive arose, from a concern that some of the interested parties were in conflict regarding appropriate responses to the threats of coastal erosion. The Task Force's goal was to develop short and long-term policy recommendations on coastal processes.

Representatives of the Task Force included members from the coastal communities, Quinault and Shoalwater tribes, state and federal agencies, environmental organizations, property owners, elected officials, the public, and others. The Task Force and its steering committee representing all the interest groups held a total of 13 meetings between August 1998 and March 1999. The meeting process included establishment of ground rules for the group; review of the charter; periodic educational presentations by the interest groups involved; and ongoing work sessions devoted to identification and exploration of the issues and concerns. After each meeting, meeting notes and, as work progressed, drafts of this document were disseminated to all members of the Task Force and interested observers.

One ground rule called for decision-making by consensus. Each of the key concepts and recommendations in this document has been actively discussed by the steering committee representing each of the interest groups in the Task Force. The full Task Force has reviewed and revised it several times as well. The meeting process has provided the maximum time to discuss issues and recommendations, with the expectation that every active member understands them. To the extent that members feel they can support this document, though it may not always agree fully with their views on the issues, consensus will exist.

The Task Force members have been asked to indicate their support by signing their names on the roster at the end of the document.

Two sections of the document have been handled somewhat differently:

- Section IV, Interests of the Task Force Participants, provided an opportunity for each interest group to identify its own interests and concerns. The contents of this section have been accepted by the Task Force without revision by those not members of each group.
- Section VII, Issues Requiring Resolution, provides a place to articulate issues which this group addressed but could not resolve in the time available, and for each interest group that chose to do so to provide a brief comment describing its view on the issue.

This report represents the result of those meetings: a document which reflects the work of all representatives of the Task Force. (See Appendix - Membership Roster)

The process by which the Task Force achieved these results included:

- Engaging a facilitator whose job was to define and implement a process for the meeting series,
- Having the facilitator conduct interviews with a cross section of the members of the Task Force prior to the first meeting to gather input about their interests and concerns,
- Providing an opportunity for each of the interest groups to make an educational presentation to the Task Force that reflected their legal considerations and interests,
- Providing a participative process to identify and prioritize the issues to be addressed in this report,
- Convening series of meetings, 4-6 hours each, of the entire Task Force and the steering committee, to address the issues identified,
- Creating of a steering committee representing the larger group,
- Developing and refining the recommendations contained in this report.

II. RESOURCES AT ISSUE

One of Washington State's most valuable and irreplaceable assets is its more than 2,500 miles of marine shoreline. The coastal zone, rich in a variety of natural, cultural, commercial, industrial, and recreational resources contributes to the present and future well being of the state. The coastal zone fish, shellfish, other living marine resources and wildlife are ecologically fragile and consequently vulnerable to destruction and/or permanent alteration by human actions.

Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of this state's renewable natural resources and must minimize interference with fishing areas by

keeping solution impact zones to a minimum. The beach/dune system and adjacent waters along the coast of southwest Washington are of critical importance to the nearby communities, the people of the Washington, and out-of-state tourists. They provide a variety of significant functions:

- protect life and property by serving as a storm barrier, which helps dissipate wave energy and contributes to shoreline stability;
- provide the basis for a tourism industry that generates revenue, which contributes significantly to the economy of the coastal communities and that of the State (\$240 million¹, 3,730 jobs and \$14,940,000 in State taxes) contributed by Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties in 1997 alone²;
- provide habitat for numerous species of terrestrial and marine plants and animals, including some which have been listed, are proposed for listing or have a high potential for being listed as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) (e.g., snowy plover, coastal coho, cutthroat trout, and steelhead),
- support other marine resources, such as razor clams, crabs, smelt, herring and other bait fish, which provide an economic, cultural, and recreational opportunity for the citizens of the state and are dependent upon clean water and sandy beaches;
- support statewide recreational resources with sandy beaches and breaking waves which contribute to tribal, state, and local economies through tourism, consumer sales, fishing, and clamming.

Sand within the Columbia littoral cell is a resource, and the Columbia River is the major supplier of sediments in the Columbia littoral cell. This cell includes the beaches from Point Grenville, Washington on the north end to Tillamook Head, Oregon on the south. The beach and near shore sands are distributed throughout the cell by seasonally reversing (but not northerly) oceanic currents and waves. This sand is not only moved along the coast and back and forth onshore to offshore, but also in and out of the estuaries. The greatest shoreline changes have occurred at the mouths of these estuaries. For the last 100 years or so, dams on the Columbia River and jetties at the inlet mouths have been contributing factors directing the movement of sand. Dredging the estuaries also has affected sand movement. These structures and activities have influenced the natural flow of sand in the Columbia cell. All of these factors affect the shoreline in a number of ways.

The coastal beaches' shape and position change because they are part of a dynamic equilibrium of material, which is always in motion. Shoreline erosion and accretion are the most visible results of the complex natural process of sediment transport and sand redistribution.

This littoral cell system, driven by a variety of natural processes, may result in a net loss or gain of sand to a particular beach area and may involve the movement of sediment across the entire continental shelf. Sediment in the coastal zone can also be influenced

¹This represents all spending by travelers to Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties during 1997.

² See Washington State Travel Impacts and Visitor Volume document, Washington State Tourism Office.

by human activities, such as dams, jetties, dredging practices, and shoreline protective structures.

Erosion becomes a significant problem when structures are erected in close proximity to unstable beach/dune systems. It is in both the public and private interests to afford the beach/dune system space to accrete and erode. Erosion and accretion will continue on Washington's coast in the future. Erosion may increase as a consequence of sea level rise due to climate change. Low frequency, high impact coastal hazards such as coastal subsidence associated with subduction zone earthquakes and tsunamis can have dramatic effects on erosion and accretion.

Recommendations:

1. Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of the state's natural resources and critical habitat; e.g., solutions should minimize interference with fishing areas and/or keep solution impacts to a minimum.
2. Dredged material should be managed as a resource and reused beneficially within the Columbia littoral cell. For example, dredged sand should remain within the active littoral zone.

III. NECESSARY ELEMENTS OF STATEWIDE COASTAL POLICY

Regulatory Framework

Current State law creates a framework for making policy decisions about coastal processes. These laws include:

- The Shoreline Management Act
- The Ocean Resources Management Act
- The Seashore Conservation Act
- The Hydraulic Code
- The Aquatic Lands Law
- The Growth Management Act
- The State Environment Policy Act
- The Planning Enabling Act

The principal federal laws applicable to the coastal erosion issue are:

- The National Environmental Policy Act
- The Clean Water Act

- The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
- The Endangered Species Act
- The Marine Protection, Resources and Sanctuaries Act
- The Coastal Zone Management Act

The local regulatory framework must be consistent with all State and federal laws while addressing specific local needs (zoning) and conditions. Local jurisdictions include a mixture of tribal, city, county, state, and federal lands with an overlay of numerous special districts such as port, fire, flood control zone, various public utility and hospital districts, and others.

Although federal, tribal, state, and local jurisdictions each have mandates to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, local jurisdictions have a generally broader and more immediate responsibility to their residents. This distinguishes local government entities from state and federal entities. Because county and city governments are based on state enabling laws, they have similar land use structures; however, there are variations in implementation at the local level.

Knowledge/Scientific Foundation

The legitimacy and effectiveness of Washington coastal policy depend upon sound science, appropriate analysis, and credible information.

Studies are currently being conducted by scientists and engineers from the State Department of Ecology, the U.S. Geological Survey, and local coastal communities. A major thrust of their studies is to understand the Columbia River sediment budget; (the sources, transport pathways, and sinks of sand that affect shoreline evolution). Local government efforts have been specifically focused on the dynamics around the historic interventions in the system, typically the navigation projects, in order to inform responses to erosion threats faced by the communities.

Recommendations:

Essential elements and recommendations of this group, include:

1. The Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study should be completed. The federal, state, and local partners will establish roles and expectations among themselves.
2. Scientific studies of coastal processes along the southwest coast of Washington should examine the influence of the Columbia River system. These studies should also include an analysis of the effects and opportunity for mitigation of past interventions in coastal processes, particularly those related to navigation projects and engineering studies describing the effects of hard structures on high-energy shorelines.

3. Long-term scientific monitoring of the condition of southwest Washington ocean beaches, and the impacts and performance of past and proposed interventions to the littoral cell system, should be a priority.
4. There should be an independent technical review of all state-funded coastal studies and analyses that will form a part of the technical foundation for long-term coastal planning, policy development, and/or proposed actions.
5. An assessment of coastal hazards, including predictions of future shoreline change rates, should be conducted.
6. An evaluation of socio-economic impacts of actions in the coastal zone should be conducted.

Fiscal Rationality/Equity/Responsibility

In light of the enormous financial ramifications of any coastal policy, the Task Force emphasized the importance of fiscal analysis for any policy or project, equitable costs and benefits, and equitable distribution of responsibility. Policy and projects related to coastal erosion should be analyzed for their long-term costs and benefits utilizing the following principles:

- costs should not exceed benefits;
- those who benefit should contribute a proportional share of the cost;
- expenditure of public funds should be consistent with existing laws governing competitive bidding;
- cost-benefit analyses should include wildlife, fish and shellfish, and other values often considered intangible.

Recommendations:

1. Policy and projects related to coastal erosion should be analyzed for their long-term costs and benefits.

Long-Range Planning

Long-range planning is essential to ensure that individual projects do not compromise Washington's long-term vision for its beaches. In the long-term, the federal, state, local, and tribal governments must develop a policy of land management that acknowledges the natural processes of the ocean and encourages and supports the work of local jurisdictions to reduce the hazards to those life and property interests, recreational opportunities, and natural resources that are located in geologically-hazardous erosion areas. This land management policy could include the following components.

- An inventory of local land use information should be undertaken to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies, should be included,
- Local, state, federal, and tribal jurisdictions could use the information gathered from the inventory to better understand how to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, particularly as it pertains to erosion-hazard areas,
- State and local governments should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone,
- As part of a comprehensive inventory, erosion-hazard zones should be mapped using available shoreline data and the current best science. Such hazard zones may incorporate both accretion and erosion areas and could identify: imminent erosion hazards, intermediate erosion hazards, and long-term erosion hazards,
- Local jurisdictions should define coastal erosion-hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high-hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy,
- Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should adopt the guidance and criteria to address coastal processes set forth in Section V,
- The State should continue to provide technical and financial assistance to local jurisdictions to review and revise comprehensive plans, flood hazard management plans, and development regulations to discourage development in coastal erosion-hazard areas,
- Local jurisdictions should develop new mechanisms or re-enforce existing mechanisms to warn those with property interests of the danger of building or buying in hazardous erosion areas,
- Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should recognize that effective coastal protection may have some economic consequences for coastal communities; and should take steps to ameliorate these impacts through measures such as shared risk, buyout assistance, and other,
- Local jurisdictions should develop long-term strategies to assess the location of critical, at-risk public infrastructure such as highways, water and sewer facilities, schools, etc. and private investments in light of coastal zone hazards. These might include threats from chronic hazards like long-term erosion.

Recommendations:

1. In the long term, the state and local governments must develop a policy of land management that:
 - acknowledges the natural processes of the ocean, and the potential conflicts with private property owners located in the erosion-hazard areas;
 - encourages and supports the work of local jurisdictions to protect life and property interests;
 - supports the efforts of governments and non-profit organizations to protect recreational opportunities and the natural qualities of the coast.
2. An inventory of local land use information should be conducted to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies should be included.
3. Local, state, federal, and tribal jurisdictions could use the information gathered from the inventory to better understand how to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, particularly as it pertains to erosion hazard areas.
4. State and local government should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone.
5. As part of a comprehensive inventory, erosion-hazard zones should be mapped using available shoreline data and current best science. Such hazard zones may incorporate both accretion and erosion areas, and could identify: imminent, intermediate, and long-term erosion-hazards.
6. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should work together to define coastal erosion-hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high-hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that mapping projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy.
7. Southwest Washington coastal communities should continue the development and analysis of alternative strategies to address current and long-term coastal erosion and accretion issues. Financial assistance from a variety of funding sources, including state funding should be sought.
8. The State should continue to provide technical and financial assistance to local jurisdictions, and tribal governments where applicable, to review and revise comprehensive plans, flood hazard management plans, and development regulations to discourage development in coastal-erosion hazard areas.

9. Local jurisdictions should develop new mechanisms, or re-enforce existing mechanisms, to warn those with property interests of the danger of building or buying in hazardous erosion areas.
10. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should recognize that effective coastal protection may have some economic consequences for coastal communities, and should take steps to ameliorate such impacts through measures such as shared risk, buyout assistance, and others.
11. Local jurisdictions should develop long-term strategies to assess the location of critical, at-risk public infrastructure such as highways, water and sewer facilities, schools, etc., and private investments in light of coastal zone hazards. These might include threats from chronic hazards like long-term erosion.

IV. INTERESTS OF THE TASK FORCE PARTICIPANTS

This section provides an opportunity for representatives from each interest group to describe the interests, concerns, and issues members of that group have with the coastal processes. The content of these comments has not been accepted as to content; therefore they do not represent the discussion and consensus of the Task Force.

Coastal Community/Local Government Interests

Coastal communities, including Indian tribes, have a direct interest in the development and implementation of a sound coastal policy, based on law and science, in order to provide for the safety, health, and welfare of their citizens.

Specific interests include:

- participation in and monitoring of the evolution of scientific knowledge on coastal issues;
- integration of up-to-date science into local planning processes;
- participation in coastal policy development;
- analysis and development of solutions to local coastal erosion problems;
- maintaining viable economies while protecting natural resources and the environment.

Local governments have been at the forefront of problems caused by coastal erosion for several years. An early assumption was that the primary cause of coastal erosion was a growing deficit of sand being delivered to the littoral system. But, based upon analyses undertaken by local communities, it has become apparent that the primary cause of the severe erosion problems in recent years is the change in energy regime in the proximity

of the major navigation projects, which have affected wave and current energy, and sand deposition and transport.

Actions taken by local governments to further restrict land use would have potentially large adverse effects on the revenue base for any of the multiple jurisdictions that depend on it to finance local services. Local lands, including coastal lands, are largely already developed in the sense that they have long been divided and zoned, creating an expectation that owners could beneficially use their properties. This long-standing expectation of use also creates the value underlying property tax revenues, the primary local government revenue base. Some communities believe that, consistent with Washington State law, restrictions on actions taken without clear and compelling justification may create a liability as a regulatory taking.

Past land use and existing uses influence decisions on new developments and can promote continuation of unwise decisions. Because local ordinances and land use management decisions will determine the future patterns of coastal development, technical assistance must be provided to local communities and coastal counties to integrate technical information into a firm foundation for coastal land use planning.

A complicating issue is the generally depressed economy in our coastal region that has historically been dependent primarily upon the forest products industry, fishing, shellfish and shipping. Even though recreation and tourism-based industries are emerging in the region, they remain only small pieces of a generally depressed coastal economy that is likely to remain so in the near future. To meet the needs of the coastal communities over the next several years, funding assistance is required to:

- facilitate understanding of, and participation in, the development of scientific information and for the integration of such information into local land use planning;
- facilitate planning for viable communities and Indian tribes that optimizes development and investment opportunities while maintaining natural resource protection;
- address issues of public infrastructure, which are threatened because they are located in coastal areas threatened by near-term coastal erosion;
- address issues of public infrastructure that may be at risk from catastrophic hazards due to subsidence from subduction earthquakes and tsunamis;
- undertake a detailed analysis of site-specific coastal erosion problems including project definition, engineering design, and project implementation;
- provide for communication, outreach, and education in the local communities on coastal erosion issues.

Specific Tribal Interests

Tribal members depend on coastal resources to provide economic goods, and cultural and spiritual requisites to sustain their unique societies. Continued tribal access to these resources should incorporate:

- continued use of coastal resources by tribes as accorded them by treaty or by Executive Order;
- continued tribal participation in the development and implementation of coastal policy; and,
- funding for technical assistance to tribes to integrate tribal planning processes with State and local planning efforts in coastal areas.

Statewide Interests and State Agency Perspectives

Statewide Interests

All citizens of the state have a vital stake in responsible management of the state's coastal shoreline and related resources. The ocean beaches, fish, shellfish, and other coastal resources are enjoyed quite extensively by citizens from throughout the state. By law, they literally own the beach, and therefore State agencies are charged with protecting this important resource for them. The statewide interest in this issue is perhaps best articulated in the following legislative findings in the Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58.020):

The Legislature declares that the interest of all of the people shall be paramount in the management of shorelines of statewide significance. The department, in adopting guidelines for shorelines of state-wide significance, and local government, in developing master programs for shorelines of state-wide significance, shall give preference to uses in the following order of preference which: (1) Recognize and protect the state-wide interest over local interest; (2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline; (3) Result in long-term over short-term benefit; (4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline; (5) Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shorelines; (6) Increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline.

Citizens of the state also have a financial interest, for they will be asked to fund many of the short and long-term solutions that will be employed to reduce the hazards to life and property posed by coastal erosion. Therefore it is important that solutions to coastal erosion issues be cost-effective and based on a long-range plan developed in partnership with all stakeholders.

State Agency Interests

The State agencies participating in the Task Force have a variety of interests, roles, and responsibilities as defined in state law. The participating agencies include Department of Ecology, Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, State Parks and Recreation Commission, State Fish and Wildlife Department, and State Emergency

Management Division of the State Military Department. These agencies provide technical assistance, emergency management services, regulatory oversight, funding assistance and many other services. Because they have such a broad array of responsibilities related to coastal erosion, these agencies have a keen interest, and play a critical role, in finding solutions to the coastal erosion issue.

Key interests and responsibilities of State agencies participating in the Task Force include:

- protecting people from erosion and flood hazards;
- providing technical assistance and grant funds to local governments and non-profits that have a stake in coastal erosion issues;
- providing technical assistance for and oversight of shoreline planning and permitting decisions;
- protecting and enhancing the public's right to access and use the publicly-owned shoreline;
- protecting and enhancing fish, shellfish, and wildlife of the coastal environment;
- working in a collaborative manner with federal, local, and tribal governments and other stakeholders to seek sound solutions to coastal erosion problems;
- ensuring that solutions to coastal erosion problems are cost-effective, protect people and the environment, and do not negatively affect adjacent lands;
- participating in coastal research and studies and providing scientific information to support long-term coastal erosion planning and policy development; and,
- ensuring that the general public has ample opportunities to participate in decision making.

Environmental Interests

The beaches and shorelines of Washington provide for the protection and maintenance of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, aesthetics, water-dependent uses, sustainable development, economic resources, and recreation. The state of Washington maintains this as a paramount policy through various state and federal laws, such as the Shoreline Management Act and the Clean Water Act.

Ocean beaches and adjacent shorelines are dynamic in short, medium and long time frames, and as such they are not amenable to "stabilization." The State should encourage soft or other non-invasive measures designed to facilitate the sustainability of renewable natural resources when permitting development, infrastructure, and navigation channels.

The State should maximize public access and low-impact uses of state beaches and shorelines. Coastal shoreline policies should recognize and support renewable resource habitat, not only in quantity but also in quality, for the services they provide to humankind. All projects should be considered for their cumulative effects on the natural processes.

Federal Interests

Federal agencies have the responsibility to protect and regulate the coast and its resources under a variety of authorities. This work is increasingly challenging due to strong and accelerating pressures to inhabit, visit, and develop the coast. These pressures are likely to increase and continue indefinitely. The objectives of a federal presence are varied and include safe navigation, ocean disposal siting, protection of critical ecosystems and natural resources, protection of water quality, and national defense.

Federal agencies bring a national and international perspective to coastal issues. They have the ability and responsibility to bring to bear knowledge of positive and negative experiences gained elsewhere.

Federal agencies often depend on information provided by others, and therefore have an interest in ensuring that the best available science is incorporated into long-term planning and project design. In collaboration with the various states, several agencies are charged with providing guidance on resource use and preservation, and enforcement of applicable regulations when necessary. Federal interests also include ensuring that states effectively implement existing regulations.

Federal agencies are responsible to ensure that federal tax dollars spent to address coastal issues are used effectively. This is of special significance because the federal government often provides the critical mass of funding for major coastal projects. Responsible use of federal funds involves such issues as appropriate competition, cost-benefit analyses, including assignment of economic values to wildlife and other intangible assets, and the use of the best available science.

Actual federal authorities are varied and are brought to bear depending on the activity planned. The major players are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Coast Guard (CG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Although legal mandates overlap greatly, living resources are chiefly administered by the NMFS, FWS, and EPA using the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA), and Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), among others. Navigation and navigation safety, including maintenance dredging of authorized projects, are the responsibilities of the Corps and/or the Coast Guard.

Permits for dredging and dredged material disposal fall under the Corps and EPA responsibilities through the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). USGS is the nation's earth science agency and is responsible for supplying independent and unbiased long-term monitoring, research, and assessments. Planning for and response to major emergencies are delegated to FEMA. The National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) plays a role in many of these issues; they "house" NMFS and administer MPRSA.

V. GUIDANCE AND CRITERIA TO ADDRESS COASTAL PROCESSES

Guidance

A variety of different methods have been used to combat coastal erosion. Among them are hard structures such as revetments and groins, and soft methods such as sand bars and beach nourishment. Other solutions involve requiring new development to be set back beyond the erosion areas and prohibiting rebuilding when homes are destroyed by coastal flooding and erosion. Dune construction, offshore sand bars and berms, jetty extensions or other modifications, setback dunes, and buying out homes and other structures located in hazard areas are other possible solutions. All these solutions have positive and negative aspects, and the use of a particular solution will vary, based on the specifics of the situation at hand.

It is important, however, that individual decisions be based upon an overall long-range plan. The Task Force recommends in Section III that the state and local governments undertake long-range planning to address coastal erosion and accretion issues. The Task Force has developed the following as interim guidance for seeking the preferred solution given the particular situation.

- A. New development in erosion hazard areas and recently accreted areas should be discouraged, base on assessment of risk.
- B. Landowners should be expected to assume all risk if they knowingly buy and develop (plat or place structures) property in such an area.
- C. New structural solutions to erosion problems should be discouraged when there is a potentially adverse impact to the natural conditions of the beach, habitat, public access, other recreational resources, long-term maintenance costs, and to adjacent properties. The spirit and intent of state laws discourage armoring such as sea walls, wave bumpers, rock revetments, and other types of hard structures in favor of other alternatives that are more likely to preserve a dune/beach environment.
- D. In rare circumstances, structural solutions should only be considered in situations where it has been determined that erosion is threatening critical public facilities such as bridges, major highways, sewage treatment plants, utility lines, and municipal water supplies.
- E. The selection and implementation of any alternative should be based upon an analysis of effectiveness, impacts, risk, and cost compared to other alternatives within a long-term plan.
- F. Maintenance and modification of existing navigation structures should be subject to the criteria as outlined below.

Criteria For Successful Solutions

Applying the following criteria, all solutions should strive to:

- be consistent with a long-range plan for coastal management;
- reduce the erosion hazard without moving that hazard to other properties;
- be consistent with the economic viability of, and minimize adverse economic impacts to the community when possible;
- reduce the risk to public health and safety;
- preserve and protect existing and potential habitat, or mitigate for any damage caused;
- preserve and protect existing recreational uses;
- work with, not against, natural beach processes;
- achieve a positive cost-benefit ratio;
- primarily benefit the public if publicly funded; all beneficiaries should share costs;
- be consistent with federal, state, local, and tribal laws and public involvement requirements;
- be based on a thorough analysis of alternatives; and,
- fully mitigate for adverse impacts of any new solution.

Recommendations:

1. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should adopt the following guidance to address coastal processes (given the unique nature of tribal reservation land, not all criteria may apply to tribes):
 - A. New development in erosion hazard areas and recently accreted areas should be discouraged, based on assessment of risk.
 - B. Landowners should be expected to assume all risk if they knowingly buy and develop (plat or place structures) property in such an area.
 - C. New structural solutions to erosion problems should be discouraged when there is a potentially adverse impact to the natural conditions of the beach, habitat, public access, other recreational resources, long-term maintenance costs, and impact to adjacent properties. The spirit and intent of state laws discourage armoring such as sea walls, wave bumpers, rock revetments, and other types of hard structures in favor of other alternatives that are more likely to preserve a dune/beach environment.

- D. In rare circumstances, structural solutions should only be considered in situations where it has been determined that erosion is threatening critical public facilities such as bridges, major highways, sewage treatment plants, utility lines, and municipal water supplies.
 - E. The selection and implementation of any alternative should be based upon an analysis of effectiveness, impacts, risk, and cost compared to other alternatives within a long-term plan.
 - F. Maintenance and modification of existing navigation structures should be subject to the criteria for successful solutions outlined in Section V.
- 2. Public education, participation, and outreach are important to a wide perspective on the issues. While this is a primary responsibility of local, state, and tribal governments, there is an awareness of the need for the general public and non-governmental organizations to participate in community education issues and recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in accomplishing this task.

VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following summary of the recommendations contained earlier in this document is organized by theme in an effort to enable the reader to quickly see the type of effort involved in the recommendation; e.g., scientific data, and which organization or organizations would need to implement the recommendations.

Scientific Data

- 1. The Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study should be completed. The federal, state, and local partners will establish roles and expectations among themselves.
- 2. Scientific studies of coastal processes along the southwest coast of Washington should examine the influence of the Columbia River system. These studies should also include analysis of the effects and opportunity for mitigation of past interventions in coastal processes, particularly related to navigation projects, and engineering studies describing the effects of hard structures on high-energy shorelines.
- 3. Long-term scientific monitoring of the condition of southwest Washington ocean beaches, and the impacts and performance of past and proposed interventions to the system, should be a priority.

An Inventory of Local Land Use and At-Risk Resources

- 4. An inventory of local land use information should be undertaken to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of

public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies should be included.

5. Federal, state, tribal, and local jurisdictions could use the information gathered from the inventory to better understand how to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, particularly as it pertains to erosion hazard areas.
6. State and local government should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone.
7. As part of a comprehensive inventory, erosion hazard zones should be mapped using available shoreline data and current best science. Such hazard zones may incorporate both accretion and erosion areas, and could identify: imminent, intermediate, and long-term erosion hazards.
8. Assessment of coastal hazards, including predictors of future shoreline change rates, should be conducted.
9. Evaluation of socio-economic impacts of actions in the coastal zone should be conducted.

Joint Policy and Development Efforts

10. In the long-term, the state and local governments must develop a policy of land management that:
 - acknowledges the natural processes of the ocean, and the potential conflicts with private property owners located in the erosion hazard areas;
 - encourages and supports the work of local jurisdictions to protect life and property interests; and,
 - supports the efforts of governments and non-profit organizations to protect recreational opportunities and the natural qualities of the coast.
11. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should adopt the following guidance address coastal processes (given the unique nature of tribal reservation land, not all criteria may apply to tribes):
 - A. New development in erosion hazard areas and recently accreted areas should be discouraged, base on assessment of risk.
 - B. Landowners should be expected to assume all risk if they knowingly buy and develop (plat or place structures) property in such an area.

- C. New structural solutions to erosion problems should be discouraged when there is a potentially adverse impact to the natural conditions of the beach, habitat, public access, other recreational resources, long-term maintenance costs, and adjacent properties. The spirit and intent of state laws discourage armoring such as sea walls, wave bumpers, rock revetments and other types of hard structures in favor of other alternatives that are more likely to preserve a dune/beach environment.
 - D. In rare circumstances, structural solutions should only be considered in situations where it has been determined that erosion is threatening critical public facilities such as bridges, major highways, sewage treatment plants, utility lines, and municipal water supplies.
 - E. The selection and implementation of any alternative should be based upon an analysis of effectiveness, impacts, risk, and cost compared to other alternatives within a long-term plan.
 - F. Maintenance and modification of existing navigation structures should be subject to the criteria for successful solutions as defined in Section V.
- 12. Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions should work together to define coastal erosion-hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that mapping projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy.
 - 13. Federal, state, and local governments should recognize that effective coastal protection may have some economic consequences for coastal communities, and should take steps to ameliorate such impacts through measures such as shared risk, buyout assistance, and others.
 - 14. There should be an independent technical review of all state-funded coastal studies and analyses that will form a part of the technical foundation for long-term coastal planning, policy development, and/or proposed actions.
 - 15. Policy and projects related to coastal erosion should be analyzed for their long-term costs and benefits.

State Support for Local Action

- 16. The State should continue to provide technical and financial assistance to local jurisdictions, and tribal governments where applicable, to review and revise comprehensive plans, flood hazard management plans, and development regulations to discourage development in coastal erosion hazard areas.

Local Policy Development

17. Southwest Washington coastal communities should continue the development and analysis of alternative strategies to address current and long-term coastal erosion and accretion issues. Financial assistance from a variety of funding sources, including state funding should be sought.
18. Local jurisdictions should develop new mechanisms or re-enforce existing mechanisms to warn those with property interests of the danger of building or buying in hazardous erosion areas.
19. Local jurisdictions should develop long-term strategies to assess the location of critical, at-risk public infrastructure such as highways, water and sewer facilities, schools, etc., and private investments in light of coastal zone hazards. These might include threats from chronic hazards like long-term erosion.

Natural Resources

20. Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of the state's natural resources and critical habitat; e.g., solutions should minimize interference with fishing areas and/or keep solution impacts to a minimum.
21. Dredged material should be managed as a resource and reused beneficially within the Columbia littoral cell. For example, dredged sand should remain within the active littoral zone.

Public Education and Outreach

22. Public education, participation, and outreach are important to a wide perspective on the issues. While this is a primary responsibility of local, state, and tribal governments, there is an awareness of the need for the general public to participate in community education issues and a recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in accomplishing this task.

VII. ISSUES REQUIRING RESOLUTION

This Task Force is pleased by members' ability to develop recommendations about a number of issues which have been the source of disagreement among the various groups concerned about the coast and its processes. However, time did not permit the resolution of all the issues raised by this group. Further, it is recognized that many of the recommendations remain general or non-specific. It is the Task Force's hope that a future process will provide more definitive guidance about policy and implementation of the issues discussed earlier in this document, as well as those contained in this section.

Unresolved issues include:

1. Any future group should continue discussion of unresolved issues, provide a connection to stakeholders, further develop and track recommendations, and bring broader knowledge and information to the issues. The forum, if any, should include local, state, tribal, and federal governments, as well as local community and environmental groups.
2. What are the most effective means to support the economies of coastal communities in the context of natural resource protection and other values?
3. Is there a disparity between regional economic gains due to the development of navigation projects serving the greater Columbia Basin, and the more localized environmental/erosion impacts along the coast?
4. Are there circumstances in which hard structures are appropriate? Should hard structural solutions be prohibited?

5. How do we address risks/threats related to catastrophic events such as earthquakes and tsunamis? Studies indicate that erosion may increase in the future as a consequence of sea level rise due to climate change, low-frequency, high-impact coastal hazards such as subduction zone earthquakes and tsunamis, and delayed effects of Columbia River dams.
6. How should funding for public education, participation, and outreach be apportioned, and should groups such as non-profits be included?
7. Should impact assistance relief be extended to communities that do not have measures in place to protect the coastal zone?

VIII.

SIGNATURE PAGES AND LETTERS OF SUPPORT

At the Coastal Erosion Task Force's last meeting on February 25, 1999, members voted on the task force document. The following pages contain the names and signatures of those Coastal Erosion Task Force members who were willing to signify their support for the Coastal Erosion Task Force Document.

We also received letters of support from some task force members; these are also included in this chapter.

Lee Daneker

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Kevin Ranker

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Guy Gelfenbaum

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Art Grunbaum

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Pearl Baller

☐ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Gary Burns

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Steve Babcock

Steve Foster

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Dale Beasley

☒ I support the document Dale Beasley

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Ron Craig

☐ I support the document Tom Kang, alternate

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Brady Engvall

☒ I support the document Brady K. Engvall

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Ron/Jane Louzon

☒ I support the document Ron Louzon L W V

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Jim Lowry

☐ I support the document _____

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Jim Phipps

☒ I support the document James B. Phipps

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Patty Seaman

☐ I support the document _____

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Rob Snow

☒ I support the document Robert B. Snow

☐ I cannot support the document _____

The reason: _____

☐ Not present

Berkeley Barker

☐ I support the document

☒ I cannot support the document

The reason: SEE MINORITY REPORT & DISSENT DATED 3-15-99 AS
ADOPTED BY WESTPORT CITY COUNCIL

Mike Daniels

☐ I support the document

☒ I cannot support the document

The reason: SEE MINORITY REPORT AND DISSENT
DATED 3-15-99 AS ADOPTED BY GRAYS HARBOR CO.
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS IN REGULAR SESSION

Pat Hamilton

☐ I support the document

☒ I cannot support the document

The reason: This is an inappropriate land grab
of private property. see minority
report!!

Gerald Heintz

☐ I support the document

☒ I cannot support the document

The reason: SEE MINORITY DISSENT

Clyde Sayce

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason: A letter from the Bd of Port of Peninsula
will follow

James Sayce

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Fred Winge

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Martin Best

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Bill Jolly

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Carol Jolly

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Steve Keller

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Steve Wells

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

Gordon White

☒ I support the document

☐ I cannot support the document

The reason:

☐ Not present

LETTERS OF SUPPORT



CITY OF OCEAN SHORES, WASHINGTON 98569

February 24, 1999

ADMINISTRATION
765 Pt. Brown Ave. NW
PO Box 909
360/289-2486
FAX 360/289-0376

FIRE DEPARTMENT
PO Box 100
360/289-3611
FAX 360/289-3709

POLICE DEPARTMENT
PO Box 100
360/289-3331
FAX 360/289-3333

PUBLIC LIBRARY
PO Box 669
360/289-3919
FAX 360/289-4318

MUNICIPAL COURT
PO Box 909
360/289-2486
FAX 360/289-0376

BUILDING DEPT.
710 Pt. Brown Ave. NE
PO Box 909
360/289-2754
FAX 360/289-2022

PUBLIC WORKS
PO Box 909
360/289-2754
Fax 360/289-2022

WATER SERVICE
PO Box 1539
360/289-2487

PLANNING DEPT.
710 Pt. Brown Ave NE
PO Box 909
360/289-2754
Fax 360/289-2022

ENGINEERING DEPT.
710 Pt. Brown Ave NE
PO Box 909
360/289-2754
Fax 360/289-2022

To: Governor Locke's Coastal Erosion Task Force Members

From: Ocean Shores City Council and Staff
Fred Winge, Mayor Pro-Tem *Fred Winge*

Subject: Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report

The City of Ocean Shores city council and staff have read with interest the Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report. The language and recommendations offered in the Report hold direct connections to the work currently in progress within the City to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and develop a long-term management strategy for our eroding coastline. The Report contains facts already evident in current statewide environmental and economic management policy.

The City of Ocean Shores is working cooperatively with the Governor's office, state and federal resource agencies, nonprofit organizations and citizens to study the impacts of specific "solutions" to its coastal erosion. Environmental, pure economic and socio-economic impacts are being evaluated through the work of the City's Interdisciplinary Team comprised of the above groups. We are creating a baseline document that will help us make decisions necessary to provide short-term stability on our coastline. The EIS will also help provide long-term policy and regulation options that prevent another situation as costly and devastating as the erosion we are now experiencing.

We support the Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report. It is a document that represents the process we are following as a strong City and a Washington coastal community. We are also a member of the Coastal Communities group; a group that shares the goal of finding solutions to the Pacific Ocean shoreline erosion issue common to us all. The City of Ocean Shores offers its support to the efforts of the State of Washington and federal and private interests as a non-adversarial partner for management of coastal shorelines using a balanced and responsible approach.

Thank you for all of your hard work. The City of Ocean Shores appreciates the efforts and energy that the Coastal Erosion Task Force has spent. Should you have any questions about current City initiatives, please contact Ocean Shores City Manager, Jack McKenzie at (360) 289-2486.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

Reply To
Attn Of: ECO-083

MAR 19 1999

Mr. Tim Douglas, Director
Department of Community Trade and Economic Development
906 Columbia Street SW
P.O. Box 48300
Olympia, WA 98504-8300

RE: Coastal Erosion Task Force and Final Report Recommendations

Dear Mr. Douglas:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate on the Coastal Erosion Task Force, and for providing staffing and facilitation support for the Task Force. We are satisfied that the recommendations outline a number of issues and future action items the state should consider as it plans for and manages in the dynamic coastal zone. Our interest in participating in the Task Force was to encourage all stakeholders to discuss together how best to address and prepare for future coastal accretion and erosion. We would like to see a large number of tools available to the state and local governments attempting to manage in these dynamic areas. Our concern has been that state and local management choices have focussed on construction of large hard structures on the beaches in an effort to stabilize them. This activity mimics past poorly conceived efforts on the east coast, and is inconsistent with maintaining the quality of Washington's coastal beaches in the long term.

Whatever management models and policies are ultimately implemented on Washington's coasts, they must be based on good information. The Task Force recommendations below are particularly important in that they form the foundation of information upon which sound coastal policy can be developed.

- #6. There should be an independent technical review of all State-funded coastal studies and analyses that will form a part of the technical foundation for long-term coastal planning, policy development and/or proposed actions.
- #11. An inventory of local land use information should be undertaken to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies, should be included.
- #13. State and local governments should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone.

Printed on Recycled Paper

- #15. Federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions should work together to define coastal erosion hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that mapping projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy.
- #22. Public education, participation and outreach are important to a wide perspective on the issues. While this is a primary responsibility of local, state, and tribal governments, there is an awareness of the need for the general public and non-governmental organizations to participate in community education issues and recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in accomplishing this task.

As more and better scientific information becomes available, and as erosion hazard areas become "defined" -- such as they can be -- a wide variety of management options should be considered. For example, the National Research Council (NRC) in "Managing Coastal Erosion", pp. 5-7, suggests identifying and delineating coastlines subject to erosion, including areas subject to imminent erosion hazards (within 10 years, the E-10 zone), intermediate hazards (within 30 years, the E-30 zone) and long-term hazards (within 60 years, the E-60 zone). Within these zones various other types of setbacks and management decisions can be made. NRC suggests that seaward of the E-10 zone, no new habitable structures be built. Between the E-10 and the E-30 zones, only moveable single family structures would be built. Finally between the E-30 and E-60 zones readily moveable structures would be built.

Although erosion is the primary concern, the dynamic coastal zone also includes recently accreted areas that may be eroded in the near future. Prudent management suggests a conservative approach to occupation or development of such areas.

Last, we draw your attention to recommendation # 1, which is the only recommendation that specifically mentions the coastal resources and qualities all stakeholders want to protect for future generations.

Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of the state's natural resources and critical habitat...

We look forward to working with other members of the Task Force in other forums to begin work on these difficult issues. Please contact me at (206) 553-1380 for any needed discussion on this letter or other coastal issues.

Sincerely,



Lee Daneker, Manager
Aquatic Resources Unit

Reference

National Academy of Sciences. National Research Council. 1990. Managing Coastal Erosion. 182 pp. National Academy Press, Washington D.C.



Mr. Steve Wells
Local Government Division
Department of Community, Trade
& Economic Development
906 Columbia Street SW
Olympia, Washington 98504

RECEIVED
MAR 15 1999
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Re: Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report

Dear Sir,

In 1998, Governor Gary Locke directed the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development to create a Coastal Erosion Task Force. The Task Force's goal was to develop short and long-range policy recommendations on coastal processes.

Friends of Grays Harbor (FOGH), a local non-profit group dedicated to clean water and a healthy estuary, would like to thank Governor Locke for inviting us to participate in this prestigious body. We soon learned that accretion and erosion are natural processes in an ever changing dynamic environment which produces rewards and losses that are indiscriminate to all. Long hours were spent crafting an erosion solution framework for the future.

Achieving consensus with so many varied interests represented and under the pressure of time constraints was admirable indeed. All parties to the Task Force Report had ample time to discuss and educate on their constituents behalf. Every word and phrase was visited and revisited to insure the report reflected each member's true position. In the end, there were issues that just could not be resolved with the time allowed, and these were put into a section called : Issues Requiring Resolution. We feel that this document will work well as an underpinning for current Federal and State law addressing erosion events on the Washington Coast.

FOGH believes that the document speaks for itself and is a vigorous beginning to an ongoing discussion into the future. Since people have chosen to alter the natural environment, to suit their own needs, then people must fix what they have altered to benefit all citizens equally. Adaptive management will be the method of rehabilitation and debate will be the method of resolving outstanding issues.

In closing, FOGH would like to leave this thought - water is our most precious resource. We urge the Governor and Legislature to work towards protecting and improving our water resources for citizens today and for future generations as well.

Best regards,

Brady Engvall Chair: Friends of Grays Harbor Dated:3/10/99

PO Box 1512 Westport, Washington, 98595-1512 Foghorn: (360) 648-2254
Email: olearycrk@aol.com URL: <http://www.techline.com/~broyster/fogh>

IX MINORITY REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES

100 W. BROADWAY, SUITE 31
MONTESANO, WASHINGTON 98563-3614
PHONE (360) 249-4222
FAX (360) 249-3203



MICHAEL F. DANIELS
DIRECTOR

GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY
STATE OF WASHINGTON

March 17, 1999

RECEIVED

MAR 18 1999

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Public Works

Russ Esses, Co. Engineer
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-4222
Fax: 360-249-2153

Planning

Ken Kimura, Director
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-5579
Fax: 360-249-3203

Building

Chris Brown, Building Official
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-5579
Fax: 360-249-3203

Environmental Health

Doug George, Director
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-4413
Fax: 360-249-3203

Utilities & Development

Kevin Varness, Director
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-4222
Fax: 360-249-3203

Facility Services

Dennis Selberg, Director
211 West Spruce
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-5753
Fax: 360-249-2753

Fire Marshal

Lance Talley
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31
Montesano, WA 98563-3614
Phone: 360-249-3911
Fax: 360-249-3805

Mr. Steve Wells, Assistant Director
Local Government Division
Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development
906 Columbia Street SW
Olympia, WA 98504

Re: Transmittal – Minority Report and Dissent from the Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report

Dear Mr. Wells:

The enclosed Minority Report and Dissent is being submitted by Grays Harbor County for inclusion with the Coastal Erosion Task Force Report on behalf of the local governments and organizations that are signatories. Our report is intended to provide constructive comment on a work in progress and does not diminish the significant progress made by the Task Force. We clearly understand that much remains to be done in order to resolve many of the issues surrounding coastal erosion and we offer our comments for that purpose.

The Southwest Washington coastal communities remain committed to open, public involvement and protection of our environment. We remain committed to a coastal environment that is also sustainable for our human society. As local governments, our responsibilities are not apart from, and certainly not in opposition to, the responsibilities of state and federal governments, though we acknowledge that viewpoints sometimes differ. We are similarly committed to good planning to help in our daily responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of our citizens.

We understand that you were under unrealistic time constraints to complete this process; we know the issues are more complex than many have perceived. We particularly want to acknowledge Patrick's hard work, and his commitment and good spirit that accompanied a difficult task. He reflects well on your agency. Together we have made a good beginning.

Sincerely,

Mike Daniels
Director of Public Services

WASHINGTON COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE REPORT

IX. Minority Report and Dissent

March 1999

Submitted on behalf of coastal communities under an inter-local agreement among Grays Harbor County, Pacific County, the Cities of Westport and Ocean Shores, and the Ports of Grays Harbor and Willapa Harbor. Other jurisdictions and local community organizations, which have also participated in the Coastal Erosion Task Force process, have concurred with this report.

This minority report is intended to accompany the Final Report of the Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force.

The first section of this minority report will provide annotated comments on the recommendations enumerated in the Executive Summary of the overall Task Force Report. Following that will be an amplification of the position of the combined coastal communities who are signatories of this minority report including a background discussion, specific recommendations and a discussion of general concerns with the Task Force process and results.

Annotation of Executive Summary of Task Force Report

Recommendations from the Task Force Report are italicized and numbered below as they appear in the Executive Summary of the Task Force Report. Comments from the communities' group follow each item and are in bold type.

The following recommendations resulted from the Task Force and steering committee meetings:

- 1. Coastal erosion solutions and policies should not come at the expense of the state's natural resources and critical habitat; e.g., solutions should minimize interference with fishing areas and/or keep solution impacts to a minimum.*

We generally concur with this recommendation but add that neither solutions to coastal erosion problems nor the policies they are founded upon should require the unmitigated sacrifice of public or private property and infrastructure. While certain interventions may impact specific resources, appropriate mitigation can protect overall wildlife populations and habitat.

- 2. Dredged material should be managed as a resource and reused beneficially within the Columbia littoral cell. For example, dredged sand should remain within the active littoral zone.*

See our specific recommendation, number 1 below.

3. *The Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study should be completed. The federal, state, and local partners will establish roles and expectations among themselves.*

It is essential that the direction of this effort be re-established as the partnership originally envisioned, building the foundation for solving problems. Both the US Geological Survey and the Department of Ecology have been fully funded for their roles in the study, as they see them. Unless the local communities can become established as effective partners, helping to frame the issues, then the value of the study to local communities will be diminished substantially. See our specific recommendation number 2 below.

4. *Scientific studies of coastal processes along the southwest coast of Washington should examine the influence of the Columbia River system. These studies should also include an analysis of the effects and opportunity for mitigation of past interventions in coastal processes, particularly those related to navigation projects and engineering studies describing the effects of hard structures on high-energy shorelines.*

We generally concur. The communities have undertaken such analyses around the entrance to Grays Harbor including Ocean Shores and Westport, and around the entrance to Willapa Bay as part of the process to select appropriate remedial actions to address coastal erosion. We are currently requesting state funds in order to undertake a detailed analysis at the mouth of the Columbia that can guide future dredging and management practices. See our specific recommendations numbers 1, 3, and 4 below.

5. *Long-term scientific monitoring of the condition of Southwest Washington ocean beaches, and the impacts and performance of past and proposed interventions to the system, should be a priority.*

We generally concur and note that all recent projects undertaken by the communities have incorporated significant monitoring of performance and effects.

6. *There should be an independent technical review of all State-funded coastal studies and analyses that will form a part of the technical foundation for long-term coastal planning, policy development and/or proposed actions.*

Even though this recommendation is limited to “state-funded” actions, we see this suggestion as potentially duplicating or superceding regulatory process. All project proponents, and all regulatory agencies, have the capacity to seek independent, outside review as they deem necessary within current rights and authorities. For proposed actions, the regulatory process IS a review. To require independent review is beyond current law and would require regulatory or statutory changes.

On a practical level, non-discretionary technical review will add to the delay and cost of proposed actions. While delays can provide for the avoidance of decisions on controversial projects, delay alone can effectively deny certain actions based not on their lack of merit but on the ability of a project proponent to absorb the increase costs of delay.

7. *Assessment of coastal hazards, including predictions of future shoreline change rates, should be conducted.*

These analyses, by local governments, are completed or underway and have informed the development of options at Ocean Shores, Westport and at Cape Shoalwater in Willapa Bay.

8. *Evaluation of socio-economic impacts of actions in the coastal zone should be conducted.*

Evaluation should include the socio-economic impacts of all alternatives, including the impact of delay or ultimately doing nothing in the face of threats to the integrity of communities.

9. *Policy and projects related to coastal erosion should be analyzed for their long-term costs and benefits.*

We concur and point out that all projects to date have achieved obviously positive benefits.

11. *In the long term, the state and local governments must develop a policy of land management that:*
 - *acknowledges the natural processes of the ocean, and the potential conflicts with private property owners located in the erosion hazard areas,*
 - *encourages and supports the work of local jurisdictions to protect life and property interests,*
 - *supports the efforts of governments and non-profit organizations to protect recreational opportunities and the natural qualities of the coast.*

These points essentially restate responsibilities already currently in law or in common practice.

12. *An inventory of local land use information should be undertaken to determine appropriate policies and actions. The inventory should include an accounting of public infrastructure, platted and unplatted properties, and built and un-built properties. Zoning overlays, as well as shoreline area designations and their applicable rules, regulations, and policies, should be included.*

Current land use patterns are relatively well understood at the local government level, where the primary responsibility lies under the Growth Management Act, the Shoreline Management Act, and other regulations.

13. *Federal, state, tribal and local jurisdictions could use the information gathered from the inventory to better understand how to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare, particularly as it pertains to erosion-hazard areas.*

We concur that a clear picture of what is at risk is an essential element of natural hazard planning. Other elements include the magnitude and frequency of risks and are addressed below.

14. *State and local governments should take steps to identify the extent of the dynamic zone and inventory existing natural and community resources within that zone.*

As above, if the “dynamic zone” is a delineation of risk, it is essential to understand the magnitude and frequency of the risk. Studies by local governments of specific problem areas to date have developed such an assessment as a foundation for planning to mitigate the risk at the community level.

15. *As part of a comprehensive inventory, erosion hazard zones should be mapped using available shoreline data and current best science. Such hazard zones may incorporate both accretion and erosion areas, and could identify: imminent erosion hazards, intermediate erosion hazards, and long-term erosion hazards.*

Again, hazards should be delineated according to risk. Based upon a full analysis, communities may decide whether to intervene with the intent of arresting a hazard, or whether to simply avoid it. Recent experience has suggested that modification of an existing intervention to reduce the hazard is frequently possible.

16. *Federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions should work together to define coastal erosion hazard areas and regulate and discourage development in high hazard coastal erosion areas. The State should work with local jurisdictions to ensure that mapping projects are based on sound science and consistency of policy.*

Once again, analysis must be based on risk and the analysis of the proximate cause of the hazard. If risk and hazard are associated effects of current or past practices and interventions, it may be more prudent to modify those practices and interventions rather than respond purely by physical avoidance.

17. *The State should continue to provide technical and financial assistance to local jurisdictions, and tribal governments where applicable, to review and revise comprehensive plans, flood hazard management plans, and development regulations to discourage development in coastal erosion hazard areas.*

We generally concur with the need to support responsible planning in the coastal zone, but note again that the discouragement of development is not necessarily appropriate where hazards, particularly effects of past practices, can be modified or effectively and efficiently mitigated.

18. *Local jurisdictions should develop new mechanisms or re-enforce existing mechanisms to warn those with property interests of the danger of building or buying in hazardous erosion areas.*

We generally concur but add that warnings need to be based upon a reliable delineation of risk.

19. *Federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions should recognize that effective coastal protection may have some economic consequences for coastal communities, and should take steps to ameliorate these impacts through measures such as shared risk, buyout assistance, and others.*

Other measures might include financial participation in implementation or modification of structures and maintenance practices.

20. *Local jurisdictions should develop long-term strategies to assess the location of critical, at-risk public infrastructure such as highways, water and sewer facilities, schools, etc. and private investments in light of coastal zone hazards. These might include threats from chronic hazards like long-term erosion.*

Again, an assessment needs to be based upon a credible delineation of risk.

21. *Southwest Washington coastal communities should continue the development and analysis of alternative strategies to address current and long-term coastal erosion and accretion issues. Financial assistance from a variety of funding sources, including state funding should be sought.*

We concur and note that the coastal communities have provided substantial resources to these efforts to date, given our financial ability. Modest state investment in the actual implementation of actions has leveraged substantial federal resources. See our specific recommendations, numbers 3 and 4 below. We need the state as an active partner to help solve our problems.

21. *Federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions should adopt the following guidance to address coastal processes (given the unique nature of tribal reservation land, not all criteria may apply to tribes):*
- A. *New development in erosion hazard areas and recently accreted areas should be discouraged, based on assessment of risk.*
 - B. *Landowners should be expected to assume all risk if they knowingly buy and develop property (plat or place structures) in such an area.*
 - C. *New structural solutions to erosion problems should be discouraged when there is a potentially adverse impact to the natural conditions of the beach, habitat, public access, other recreational resources, long-term maintenance costs, and impact to adjacent properties. The spirit and intent of state laws discourage armoring--such as sea walls, wave bumpers, rock revetments, and other types of hard structures--in favor of other alternatives that are more likely to preserve a dune/beach environment.*

Responsible decision-making will consider an environmental impact that can be appropriately mitigated in balance with a full range of socio-economic interests across a broad-based community.

- D. Structural solutions should only be considered in situations where it has been determined that erosion is threatening critical public facilities such as bridges, major highways, sewage treatment plants, utility lines, and municipal water supplies.*
- D. The selection and implementation of any alternative should be based upon an analysis of effectiveness, impacts, risk, and cost compared to other alternatives within a long-term plan.*

While a long-term plan is a worthy goal, we note that plans may not anticipate adequately the nature of emergent problems – we are constantly learning. In any case, prudent near term actions must be based on the best information available at the time and cannot be held hostage to a long-term plan which may be incomplete or inconclusive.

- E. Maintenance and modification of existing navigation structures should be subject to the criteria for successful solutions outlined in Section V.*

We generally concur, in the context of comments herein.

- 22. Public education, participation, and outreach are important to a wide perspective on the issues. While this is a primary responsibility of local, state, and tribal governments, there is an awareness of the need for the general public and non-governmental organizations to participate in community education issues and recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in accomplishing this task.*

We clearly understand the responsibilities of government in general and acknowledge that education is a two-way street. Also, we are responsible for a public trust that encompasses many aspects of our interaction with our coastal areas. In a democratic society we, as governments, have the responsibility to allow our citizens to enjoy a future they choose, consistent with law. We must learn from the public what they want their future to be.

Background

Beginning in late 1993 the coastal communities of Southwest Washington recognized the potential for significant impacts to their communities from erosion on the ocean coast. While the specific causes for erosion “hot spots” was not well understood at the time, prudent actions were taken first at Westport, and subsequently at Ocean Shores and at the entrance to Willapa Bay to protect communities, property, and infrastructure from immediate catastrophic impacts.

Preliminary speculation at the time suggested that the coast may be entering a long-term erosional trend owing to the attenuation of the historic sand source from the Columbia River. The sandy beach area of Southwest Washington is predominantly nourished and maintained with sand from the Columbia River. Then, as now, the typical method of dredged sand disposal places material out of the near-shore littoral drift system, losing that sand as replenishment for natural erosion. The impacts of a century’s

intervention into the Columbia system with dams, jetties, and dredging seemed to be revealing itself on the beaches as erosion.

With the active support of a consortium of affected local jurisdictions, the US Geological Survey and the Washington Department of Ecology established the Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study. From the beginning, it was intended by the local jurisdictions that the study would be a fully cooperative effort to undertake the scientific investigations and analyses necessary to understand the functioning of the coastal system influenced by the Columbia River, specifically related to the maintenance of our sandy-beach shoreline.

Our expectation was that information from the coastal erosion study would help us solve coastal erosion problems. It was hoped that specific information could guide the responsible actions of local governments to protect their citizens and communities and could guide the actions of federal agencies responsible for permitting and maintaining navigation projects. It was understood that the local jurisdictions would need to rely on financial assistance from state and federal governments in order to undertake their responsibilities and that specific actions would be developed both cooperatively and by individual jurisdictions.

After several years of unsuccessful partnership on coastal erosion from the communities' perspective, the Coastal Erosion Task Force was convened at the Governor's direction as a forum to facilitate discussion and to inform both short-term and long-term actions in the state. The following recommendations are intended to enhance the cooperative efforts of all parties and allow for the long-term resolution of coastal erosion issues and problems.

Specific Recommendations

- 1.) **Beneficial Use of Dredged Materials (Sand):** Sand is a resource that has historically been disposed of in a "least cost" fashion. **The direct placement in the near shore system of sand derived from operation and maintenance dredging of navigation projects can restore much of the sand volume historically derived from the Columbia, allowing the beach/dune system to maintain and restore itself through largely natural processes.** This would particularly benefit the erosion "hot spots" and could eliminate potential impact to crab fisheries and other natural resources resulting from disposal further offshore in deeper water, or over a wide area. Current US Army Corps of Engineers proposals could limit or eliminate the availability of dredged sand from the mouth of the Columbia for beneficial use on Washington's ocean coast and should be modified to facilitate beneficial use.

Onshore and near-shore placement of dredged sand has been an important and successful element of the erosion abatement strategy being implemented at Westport and at the State Route 105 protection project in the mouth of Willapa Bay.

- 2.) **Ongoing Scientific, Technical, and Policy Initiatives:** The intensive study of coastal processes (Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study) began several years ago as a broad based scientific effort by the US Geological Survey and the Department of Ecology, along with other agency and academic partners. **The coastal communities expected to be a full partner in the direction and execution of the study.** They continue to be necessary as partners in order that the study ultimately inform community choices of potential courses of action to address problems associated with coastal erosion.

New coastal policy, particularly to the extent that it will require modification to existing laws and regulations, should be developed through appropriate public and legislative processes. A continued coastal erosion task force may be a useful

venue for discussion of issues but will require substantial financial support to assure that local communities are full participants.

- 3.) **Analysis of Coastal/Coastline Stability:** Studies undertaken to date by coastal communities in conjunction with the coastal erosion study indicate that much of the Washington coast is relatively stable. Along long stretches it continues to accrete. The severe erosion experienced in recent years seems to be associated with dynamics around existing navigation projects created by jetties, channel location, and removal of sand from the system. Further in-depth analysis is required at other “hot spot” locations, particularly the area immediately north of the North Jetty at the Columbia River to assess the eventual impact and to inform management practices including potential beneficial use of dredged sand. Community studies have formed a basis for actions to mitigate risk at Ocean Shores, Westport, and at the mouth of Willapa Bay.
- 4.) **Mitigation of Impacts of Past Interventions – Navigation Projects:** Analysis undertaken by the communities indicates that projects to enhance navigation at major inlets along the Southwest Washington Coast have had significant impacts, causing or aggravating coastal erosion in the vicinity of the projects. These effects have not been readily apparent until recently, late in the life cycle of projects that are sometimes a century old. Many of these projects have provided large economic benefits to the entire region and continue to achieve their intended purposes. Only now with better modeling and understanding can we understand their wider impacts. With better knowledge we should now redesign or modify these structures to diminish or mitigate for their adverse effects.
- 5.) **Local Planning for Coastal Hazards:** The existing structure of land use law and regulation in Washington places the primary responsibility for sound land use at the local government level. Any new regulatory scheme that would deny long standing expectations of land use and development must be clearly developed for the public good and firmly based on scientifically determined assessments of risk and impact. **Where appropriate, mechanisms must be developed to offset or compensate for potential takings and losses to individuals and to the community tax base.**

Recommendations - State Funding Support

All of the above will require state resources over the next biennium to augment the efforts of local communities if we are to solve our real problems and achieve a responsible partnership with state and federal agencies. While we are constantly reminded of “state-wide” interests, those are not in opposition to local interests. We are all different levels of government, working for the benefit of our citizens. Because of our size and our generally depressed economies, the coastal communities do not have the resources to fully meet our responsibilities on these issues without additional state resources. Significant local resources have been brought to the task and we have come together under an inter-local agreement to address our issues in common and to support each other in our separate initiatives.

We have made a thoughtful and responsible request of our Governor and our Legislature for funding in both the current supplemental budget process and for the 1999-01 biennium budget. In recent years the study effort of state and federal agencies has been fully funded. The coastal communities have received state funding far below our requests and our demonstrated need. Even so, we have effectively leveraged the resources we have had, resulting in approximately \$40 million of federal investment in coastal projects since 1994. As a result, we know that our communities were spared significant damage, particularly over the last two storm seasons. We also know that the state has recaptured its investment on coastal erosion many times over. But our efforts are not complete, there are still problems

to be solved. It remains that neither our communities, nor our state, will be served if we cannot obtain the resources needed to participate fully in the future of our coast.

General Comments on the Task Force Report

Coastal policy *per se* is implemented by various levels of government according to their responsibilities and according to the authorities provided by a foundation in law. The Task Force was comprised of numerous individuals who, to at least some extent, were self selected and brought many specific points of view and beliefs to the discussion of coastal issues. **Some recommendations exceed the bounds of current law and must be considered in that light.** While the announced goal of the Task Force process was to forge consensus, it remains illusive for several reasons. A common point of view suggests that coastal erosion wouldn't be a problem if communities were not where they are; retreat and avoidance of risk were frequently proposed as preferable options. But our communities do exist and responsible problem-solving requires the broad analysis of a full range of options including intervention. Environmental concerns related to actions along the coast were a dominant topic of the Task Force discussion, though environmental protection alone does not achieve the responsible balancing of issues and interests of concern either to our coastal communities specifically or to the broader society as a whole.

Communities must better understand the likelihood and magnitude of risks they face, with knowledge of uncertainty, costs and impacts. Coastal policy must address a potentially dynamic area with impacts that may occur in the short-term or long-term, impacts that may be ongoing and chronic, or episodic and catastrophic. Investments in mitigation and in community infrastructure must be made responsibly and costs must be shared equitably across society. Through the coastal erosion study, including the analyses undertaken specifically by the coastal communities, our understanding of these issues has become more informed in recent years.

To date, the Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study has been driven as a purely scientific study, primarily by state and federal agencies, and somewhat detached from the immediate questions facing our communities. We are now in the latter stages of this intensive study of coastal processes affecting our coast. If our local communities can, even at this late date, cooperatively frame the questions that can be answered by a scientific study, we can still build the solid foundation needed to discuss and develop sound coastal policy. In short, our communities can seek their future.

Some conflicts will remain political in nature and not amenable to resolution simply through a more detailed scientific understanding of processes. These conflicts are appropriately resolved through the conventional channels of public discourse and decision-making. It is doubtful any broad-based task force could resolve all levels of conflict over these issues, though ongoing discourse will clarify the understanding and interests of the many parties and lead to better public decisions. Science alone will not reveal a clear to coastal erosion problems, it provides a decision-making tool for community choices

Some individuals instinctively feel the only proper response to any potential hazard is retreat and avoidance. In its most conservative, a coastal "set-back" sufficient to avoid all coastal hazards would eliminate the character of many communities, if not the communities themselves. The preservation of the coast is seen, on one level, as a wilderness issue, even though its natural state and functions are compromised by previous interventions such as the navigation projects, or by the introduction of non-native vegetation. This point of view essentially dismisses the potential to mitigate the impacts of previous interventions, such as the navigation projects, that are now understood to cause specific problems. Examples include direct beach placement of sand or other beneficial use of dredged materials, or the redesign or rehabilitation of a jetty structure.

It is important to note that permanent hard structures on the Washington coast are very rare; the cost and the current regulatory structure requires extraordinary rationale before any can be permitted. While some would prohibit hard structures altogether, communities might favor specific interventions that can maintain community integrity but might alter the natural character of small, specific reaches of coastline. Mitigation of adverse impacts is, of course, essential. But, if we understand the

impacts of altering specific reaches of coastline within our communities, then whether to do so remains a broader political question. It may be informed by science, but the decision is appropriately political and existing regulatory decision-making processes recognize that.

Policy direction under discussion would further limit the ability of private property owners to protect current structures and land uses at risk, or potentially at risk, from coastal erosion. Structural protection to preserve the integrity of existing land use remains among the most controversial issues discussed by the diverse parties on the Task Force. Lands that are currently zoned and platted to accommodate further improvement are considered as developed whether or not structures or improvements have been made. Investment decisions, tax valuations, and local government revenues rely upon the land use expectations established through current zoning and platting. Policy decisions that sacrifice current and potential land use will cause serious disruption to private and public finance. Absent clear and compelling justification, accompanied by fair compensation, denial of the ability to protect the value of at-risk properties can be a regulatory taking.

Conclusion

How the Task Force Report will be used in support of the current regulatory processes remains a great concern. Regulatory decisions may inappropriately rely on positions discussed in the Report that are outside the current regulatory structure and do not represent clear agreement. Situations have already developed where community proposals have been opposed by regulatory agency staff and by interest groups specifically because of language in early draft versions of a Task Force report, clearly before any consensus was achieved. In a broad sense, all issues under discussion remain “unresolved”. The report must be considered as interim; at its best it acknowledges the need for continued state investment in the understanding of our ocean coast.

The development of coastal policy, particularly any policy that will require statutory and regulatory changes, or that requires significant changes to current local policy is purposely long and thoughtful. Still, communities must not be prevented from taking prudent actions in the near term to maintain a community’s integrity, based upon current understanding of coastal processes. With full partnership and focused efforts, our understanding of coastal processes and issues will evolve in the coming years, and so to should our coastal policies.

(Signature page follows.)

We the undersigned represent our respective jurisdictions and have been duly authorized to sign the local government Minority Report and Dissent from the Washington Coastal Erosion Task Force Report.

GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY

Dick Dixon 3-15-99
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners DATE

PACIFIC COUNTY

Pat Hamilton 3-17-99
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners DATE
as per 3.8.99 meeting of Pacific County Bd. of Commissioners

PORT OF GRAYS HARBOR

Ronald Flury 3/16/99
Executive Director DATE

PORT OF WILLAPA HARBOR

Leahly Henry
Commissioner DATE

CITY OF WESTPORT

Billy Webb 3/17/99
Mayor DATE

COLUMBIA PACIFIC R.C. & D.

James Walsh 3/17/99
Executive Director DATE

GRAYS HARBOR CHAMBER of
COMMERCE

LeRoy Lipton 3-15-99
Executive Vice President DATE

APPENDIX I

WASHINGTON COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

The following were members or alternates of this Task Force. Steering Committee participants are identified with an * following their names. Participants in general Task Force Meetings are identified in bold.

LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS

Members	Alternates
Berkeley Barker *	Randy Lewis *
Mayor	City of Westport
PO Box 505	PO Box 505
Westport, WA 98595	Westport, WA 98595
Mike Daniels *	Chuck Gale*
Grays Harbor Public Works	Pacific International Engineering
Department	4018 Sunset Beach Dr. NW
100 West Broadway, Suite 31	Olympia, WA 98502
Montesano, WA 98563	
Pat Hamilton	Mike Desimons
Commissioner	Pacific County Department of Community Development
Pacific County	318 N. 2nd Street
PO Box 187	Long Beach, WA 98631
South Bend, WA 98586	
Gerald Heintz	Jim Neva
Port of Willapa	Port of Willapa Harbor
1725 Ocean Ave.	1725 Ocean Ave.
Raymond, WA 98577	Raymond, WA 98577
Clyde Sayce	
Commissioner	
Port of Peninsula	
PO Box 205	
Ocean Park, WA 98604	
James R. Sayce	
City of Long Beach	
PO Box 310	
Long Beach, WA 98631	
Fred Winge	Terry Vietz
City of Ocean Shores	732 Point Brown Ave. NE
P.O. Box 1393	Ocean Shores, WA 98569
Ocean Shores, WA 98569	

LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Members	Alternates
Dale Beasley* Columbia River Crab Fisherman's Association P.O. Box 461 Ilwaco, WA 98624	
Ron Craig Willapa Alliance of Pacific County PO Box 278 South Bend, WA 98568	
Brady Engvall * Friends Of Grays Harbor & CRC 3714 Oyster Pl. E Aberdeen, WA 98520	Dave Palmer P.O. Box 586 Oakville, WA 98568
Ron & Jane Louzon League of Women Voters 64 Leutz Rd. Aberdeen, WA 98520-9637	Diane Muir Grays Harbor League of Women Voters 1727 S. Boone, #301 Aberdeen, WA 98520
Jim Lowry Pacific COEDC 408 Second Street Raymond, WA 98577	
Jim Phipps* Grays Harbor College 1620 Edward Smith Dr Aberdeen, WA 98520-7599	
Patty Seaman 184 Damon Road Hoquiam, WA 98550	
Rob Snow Pacific County Citizen Representative PO Box 324 Long Beach, WA 98631	
LeRoy Tipton Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce 506 Duffy Street Aberdeen, WA 98520	

Jim Walls
Columbia Pacific Resource
Conservation and Economic
Development District
303 S. I Street
Aberdeen, WA 98520

STATEWIDE ORGANIZATIONS

STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Members

Martin Best
Emergency Management Division
Recovery Section
Camp Murray, WA 98430

Bill Jolly
WA State Parks
PO Box 42668
Olympia, WA 98504

Carol Jolly
Office of Executive Policy
PO Box 43113
Olympia, WA 98504

Steve Keller
WA Department of Fish & Wildlife
48 Devonshire Road
Montesano, WA 98563

Steve Wells
Local Government Division
Department of Community, Trade,
& Economic Development
906 Columbia Street, SW
Olympia, WA 98504

Gordon White*
WA Department of Ecology-SEA
Program
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Alternates

Chuck Hagerhjelm
Emergency Management Division Recovery Section
Camp Murray, WA 98430

Partick Babineau *
Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development
906 Columbia Street, SW
Olympia, WA 98504

Therese Swanson *
WA Department of Ecology-SEA Program
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

STATEWIDE ORGANIZATIONS

Members	Alternates
Art Grunbaum * Friends of Grays Harbor & <i>Washington Environmental Council</i> PO Box 1512 Westport, WA 98595-1512	Josh Baldi* Washington Environmental Council 615 Second Ave, Suite 380 Seattle, WA 98104
Kevin Ranker * WA State Chapter Surfrider Foundation PO Box 1344 Friday Harbor, WA 98250	Randi Baugh Surfrider Foundation E. Highway 106 Union, WA 98592

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Members	Alternates
Lee Daneker* US Environmental Protection Agency, Region X 1200 6th Ave MS ECO-083 Seattle, WA 98101	Justine Barton * US Environmental Protection Agency, Region X 1200 6th Avenue ECO-083 Seattle, WA 98101
Guy Gelfenbaum * USGeological Survey, Mail Stop 999 345 Middlefield Road Menlo Park, CA 94025	Otto Moosburner * US Environmental Protection Agency, Region X 1200 6th Avenue ECO-083 Seattle, WA 98101
Steve Foster Chief of Planning US Army Corps of Engineers Seattle Division PO Box 3755 Seattle, WA 98214-3755	Brent Mahan Acting Chief of Planning US Army Corps of Engineers Seattle Division P.O. Box 3755 Seattle, WA 98214-3755
Steve Babcock Planning Branch US Army Corps of Engineers PO Box 3755 Seattle, WA 98124-3755	

TRIBES

Members

Pearl Baller
Quinalt Indian Nation
PO Box 189
Taholah, WA 98587

Gary Burns*
Shoalwater Bay
Tribal Environmental Program
PO Box 130
Tokeland, WA 98590

Alternates

Harold Charles, Jr
Quinalt Indian Nation
PO Box 189
Taholah, WA 98587

John Sims *
Quinalt Indian Nation
PO Box 189
Taholah, WA 98587

Herbert Whitish
Shoalwater Bay Tribe
PO Box 130
Tokeland, WA 98590

VISITORS AND OTHERS WHO RECEIVED OUR MAILINGS

The Hon. Jim Buck
House of Representatives
P.O. Box 40600
Olympia, WA 98504

The Hon. Mark Doumit
House of Representatives
PO Box 156
Cathlamet, WA 98612

The Hon. Lynn Kessler
House of Representatives
62 Kessler Lane
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Laura Heath
Shoalwater Bay Tribe
P.O. Box 130
Tokeland, WA 98590

David Molenaar
Quinalt Indian Nation
Fisheries Division
P.O. Box 189
Taholah, WA 98587

The Hon. James Hargrove
Senator
PO Box 427
Hoquiam, WA 98550

The Hon. Sid Snyder
Senator
PO Box 40482
Olympia, WA 98504-0482

Harry Hosey
Pacific International Engineering
310 Waterfront Park Bldg.
Edmonds, WA 98020

Leni Oman
Washington Department of
Transportation
Olympia, WA 98504

Dee Anne Shaw
P.O. Box 40482
Olympia, WA 98504

Fred Seavey
US Fish & Wildlife
Western WA Office
510 Desmond Dr. SE
Lacey, WA 98503

Steve Spencer
Shoalwater Bay Tribe
P.O. Box 130
Tokeland, WA 98590

Craig Zora
WA Department of Natural Resources
Olympia, WA 98504

Tom Hyde
Reporter
North Coast News
P O Box 272
Ocean Shores, WA 98569

Vladimir Shepsis
Pacific International Engineering
310 Waterfront Park Bldg.
Edmonds, WA 98020

Nabiel Shawa
City Administration
115 Balstead Avenue West
PO Box 310
Long Beach, Wa 98631

Mary E. Weed
Grays Harbor League of Women
Voters
52 Panhandle Rd.
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Tracy Deaten
Willapa Harbor Herald
PO Box 706
Raymond, WA 98577

APPENDIX II

MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEETS

Coastal Erosion Task Force

Aug - 1999

Name	From	TEL.#	Fax or E-mail
Potrik Robinson	CTED	(360) 586-1239	Potrik B G CTED, WA, GO
Steve Kellasuk	WDFW	(660) 244-1223	KELLASUK w DFW, WA, GO
Jim Walls	Col. PAC RIV	(360) 533-4418	JimWalls@colpac.org
Darry Burns	Shoalwater Bay	(360) 267-3101	burns@techline.com
Mike DeSimone	PACIFIC CO.	360 642-9382	fax 642-9387
Julie Maquerrmann	Ecology	360 407-6307	smaw 461@ecy.u
Chuck Golen	Pacific Int'l	360-701-0811	chuckg@piengr.com
Michael Daniels	G.H.Co.	360-249-4222	mdaniels@Co.group-haber.
Guy Gelfenbaum	USGS	650-329-5483	ggelfenbaum@usgs.gov
Breckling Backer	Westport Mayor	360-268-0131	
Randy Lewis	City of Westport Administration	(360) 268-0131	cityadm@techline.com
Clyde Seyde	Port of Peninsula	(360) 663-4764	
PAT SEAMAN	NEAR OS	(360) 289-2678	
Carol Jolly	Gov's Office	360-902-0639	Fax 360-586-8380 carol.jolly@ofm.wa.gov
FRED WIRGE	OCEAN SHORES	360-289-4186	FAX 360/289-0376
KEVIN RANKER	SURFRIDER FOUNDATION	360-378-2319	WINTERMAN@ROCKISLAND.COM
BRADY ENGVALL	FOGH & CRC	360-268-5518	BRODYSTER@TECHLINE.
ARTHUR GRUNBAUM	WEC, FOGH & CRC	360-648-2476	OCCUPYCRK@AOL.COM
Pat Hamilton	Pacific County	360-875-9337	
Rob Snow	Long Beach	360-665-6763	
Harold Charlton	QIW	360-962-2051	
Tim Lowery	Pacific BOEDC	360-942-3629	pcedc@willapa.gov.org
(Deaton) Acy DEATON	VILLARA-NARBER-VERAID	360-942-3466	
Rene Shaw	Sen Sid Snyder	780-7031	shaw.de.ole.wa.gov
ROY Tipton	Grays Hair Chamber	532-1924	gchamber@techline.com

✓ Lee Donahue
DANEKER

US EPA

206-553-1380
Fax: 206-553-1775

USEPA
Region 10
1200 6th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98101
MS ECO-002

✓ Rep Mark L. Doumit
House of Representatives
P.O. Box 40600
Olympia, WA 98504

Tel. (360) 786-7870

✓ = New Task Force members

Fred Winge
POB 1393
O.S. 98569

R. Lewis
City of WP
PO Box 505
W.P. 98595

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE - September 15, 1998 Meeting

Name	Agency	Telephone#	Fax#	E-mail
Patrick Babineau	CTED	(360) 586-1239	(360) 753-2950	PetrickB@CTED.WA
Guy Gelfenbaum	USGS	(650) 329-5483	(650) 329-5190	ggelfenbaum@usgs.
PAT SEAMAN	—	(360) 289-2678	—	—
RON LAUZON	LWV OF BH	533 3133	—	—
Diane Muir	LWU f6lt	(360) 533-1628	—	dmuir@hotmail.com
Gary Burns	Shoalwater Bay Tribe	360 267 3101	267 2504	burns@techline.c
* JOHN SIMS	Quinault Indian Nation	360/276-8215 EXT 347	360-276- 4181	jsims@quinault.c
BRADY ENIGVALL	FRIENDS OF GRAYS HBR	360 268 5518	360 268 0077	BRADYSTEL@TECHL
Justine Barton	US EPA	206-553-4974	206-553-1775	barton.justine@epamail.com
Terry Swanson	Ecology	(360) 407-6789	360 407-6535	TSWA461@ecy.wa.gov
GORDON WHITE	Ecology	(360) 807-6777	" "	GWH461@ecy.wa.gov
STEVE WELLS	CTED	360 753 1198	—	STEVEW@CTED.WA
LEE DANERER	US EPA	206-553-1380	206-553-1775	danerer.lee@epamail.com
OTTO MOOSBURNER	" "	206-553-5198	" "	moosburner.otto@epamail.com
Steve Kalkreuth	WOFW	(360) 244-1223	(360) 664-0689	KALKREUTH@DFW.WA.GOV
Clyde Syce	Port of PENN.	(360) 665-4769	(360) 665-6563	—
MIKE DANIELS	G.W.Co.	360-249-4222	360-249-3203	m.daniels@Co.grays-harbor.wa.us
Chuck Gale	Pacific Intl Engineering	425-921-1704	425-744-1100	chuckg@piengr.com
Dee Anne Shaw	LA/Sen. Sid Snyder	360-786-7636/7520 fax	—	shaw-dee@leg.wa.gov
Carol Jolly	Gov's Policy Office	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	carol.jolly@ofm.wa.gov
FRED WINGE	Ocean Shores Council	360-289-4186	360-289-0376	—
Bill Jolly	WSPRC	360/902-8641	360/664-0278	Billj@Parks.WA
RANDY LEWIS	City of WESTPORT	360-268-0131	360-268-0921	Cityadmin@techline.c
Berkley Barker	Mayor WESTPORT	"	"	"

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE PARTICIPATION LIST/DATE: 9/15/98

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
1. Bill Jolly WA State Parks	POB 42668 OLYMPIA 98504	360/902-8641	360/664-0278	Bill Jolly WA. Gov
2. Fred Wintse Ocean Shores City Council	P.O. Box 1393 Ocean Shores 98569-1393	360/289-4186	360/289-0376	
3. Carol Jolly Governor's Policy Office	PO Box 43113 Olympia 98504-3113	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	cardjolly@ofm.wa.gov
4. Chuck Gaile Pacific Impl. Engr.	310 W. 1st Street 144 Rainier Ave Edmonds WA 98020	425-921-1704	425-744-1400	chuckg@piengr.com
5. Mike Daniels Grays Harbor County	100 WEST BROADWAY SUITE 31 MONTESANO WA 98633	360-249-4222	360-249-3203	m.daniels@co.grays-harbor.wa.us
6. Clyde Sayce Port of Beninsula	POB 205 OCEAN PARK WA 98040	360/665-4764	360/665-6563	
7. Steve Kellner WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife	48 DEVENSHIRE RD MONTESANO, WA 98633	(360) 249-1223	(360) 664-0689	KELLESNIK @ DFW. WA. GOV
11. Otto Moosburner WSEA	1200 6TH AVE SEATTLE, WA 98101	206-578-5553	206-553-1775	MOOSBURNER.OTTO@epa.mn.us

	address	work#	fax	email
12. LEE DANEKER	USEPA 1200 SIXTH AVE SEATTLE WA 98101 ECO-083	206-553-1380	206-553-1775	danek@epamail.epa.gov
13. STEVE WELLS	CTED	360 753 1198		STEVEN@CTED.WA.GOV
14. GORDON WHITE	Ecology	360 907-6977 407-6977	(360) 407-6535	gwhite@ecy.wa.gov
15. Therese Swanson	ECOLOGY	(360) 407-6789	(360) 407-6535	Tswan@ecy.wa.gov
16. Justine Barton	US EPA	206-553-4974	206-553-1775	barton.justine@epamail.epa.gov
17. BRADY ENGVALL	CHEHALIS RIVER COUNCIL FORGH	360 268 5518	360 268 0077	BRODYSTER@TECHLINE.COM
18. JOHN SIMS	QUINAVULT INDIAN NATION	360/276-8215 x 347	276-481	jsims@quinault.org
19. GARY BURNS	Snoqualmie Bay Reservation	360 267 3101	360 267 2504	burns@techline.com
20. CAMI BAUGH	ENVIRONMENTAL COLUMNIST	360 490 2231		yudquo@hotmail.com



	WORKS	FOR	EMAIL
21. MIKE DESIMONIS	PACIFIC COUNTY-OCG 318 NO. 2ND ST. LONG BEACH WA 98833	360 642-9382	
22. ARTHUR (A.D.) GRUNBACH	1128 STATE RTE 105 ABERDEEN, WA 98520	(206) 382-8206	DUGANCRIS@AOL.COM
23. Diane Muir	64LWV 1727 S. Boone #103 Aberdeen 98520	537-1626	dmmuir@hotmail.com
24. Josh Baldi	W E C	206-622-8103	joshbaldi@aol.com
25. PAT SEARMAN	184 DAMON RD HOQUIAM WA 98550	360-289-2678	
26. Guy Geltenbaum	USGS 345 Middlefield Rd MS999 Menlo Park CA 94025	(650) 325-5483	ggeltenbaum@usgs.gov
27. Ron Lauzon	L W V OF G H		
28. Potrin Bobianu	CTED	(360) 586-1237	Petrick B. G. CTED. WA.GOV.
29. Berkeley Barbuzi	MAJOR (E.T.) of WASHINGTON	(360) 268- 0131 0131	Cityhall@techline.com

30.	RANDY LEWIS	ADMINISTRATOR CITY OF WESTPORT	360-268-0131	360-268-0921	cityadmin@technix.com
31.	Jane Larson	League of Women Voters	360-249-4222	360-533-3133	
32.					
33.					
34.					
35.					
36.					
37.					
38.					

**COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE
PARTICIPATION LIST**

DATE: Oct 6, 1998

NAME/ORGANIZATION*	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
(*Please indicate if you are a member (M), an alternate (A), or a guest (G).)				
1. <u>Pacific Business</u>	<u>CTED</u> <u>Olympia, WA.</u>	<u>(360) 586-1239</u>	<u>(360) 753-2450</u>	<u>Petnick B. @ CIED. WA.GOV.</u>
2. <u>Breezy Barker</u> (M)	<u>Mayor</u> <u>City of Westport</u>	<u>(360) 268-0131</u>	<u>(360) 268-0921</u>	<u>City Hall @ Techline.com</u>
3. <u>Randy Lewis</u> (A)	<u>City Administrator</u> <u>City of Westport, P.O. Box 505</u> <u>Westport, WA 98595</u>	<u>360-268-0131</u>	<u>360-268-0921</u>	<u>City admin @ techline.com</u>
4. <u>Fred Klinge</u> (M)	<u>Councilman</u> <u>Ocean Shores</u>	<u>360 289-1186</u>	<u>360 289-0576</u>	
5. <u>Gerald Heintz</u> (M)	<u>1725 Ocean Ave.</u> <u>Port of Willapa</u>	<u>AVE. RYMOND, WA 98577</u> <u>360 942-2581</u>	<u>360 942-5865</u>	
6. <u>Lee Janaker</u> (M)	<u>U.S. EPA</u>	<u>206-553-1380</u>	<u>6984</u> <u>206-553-1775</u>	<u>clanaker.lee @</u> <u>gsa@mail.epa.gov</u>
7. <u>Steve Kiehl</u> (M)	<u>WOFW</u>	<u>(360) 249-1223</u>	<u>(360) 664-0687</u>	<u>KS@bismk20.off.wa.gov</u>
8. <u>Therese Swanson</u> (A)	<u>Ecology</u> <u>Olympia WA</u>	<u>(360) 407-6789</u>	<u>(360) 407-6535</u>	<u>TSWA461@ecy.wa.gov</u>
9. <u>LeRoy Tipton</u>	<u>Grays Harbor</u> <u>Chamber of Commerce</u>	<u>360-532-1924</u>	<u>360-533-7945</u>	<u>gchamber@techline.com</u>
10. <u>Garra White</u>	<u>Ecology</u> <u>Olympia, WA.</u>	<u>(360) 407-6977</u>		<u>GW4146@ecy.wa.gov</u>

11.							
M	KEVIN RAUKER	PO 3374 RIPPY HARBOR, WA 98250 SURFIDEAL FOUNDATION	(360) 378-2319	(360) 378-2324	WARR@1412@ROCKISLAND.COM		
M	BRADY ENGVALL	FRIENDS OF G. HEDON. 3714 PASTER PK. E. HEDON. PHEASANT RIVER LODGE	(360) 268-5518	(360) 268-0677	BRADYSTER@COM		
	ARTHUR GRUNBAUM	WASH. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCIL (WISC) TECH (FRIENDS OF GH)	(206) 382-8206	(206) 382-8415	OLGAP@CRU@ADL.COM		
M	Don Lauzon	64 LUTZ RD Abundum					
		1 WV 98520	360 533 3137				
X A	Diane Muir	1727 S. Bown #103 Abundum 98520	(360) 533-1623		dmuir@hotmail.com		
M	PATTY SEAMAN	134 DAMON RD HOBART WA 98550	360-289-8698				
M	Carol Jolly	Exec. Policy Office PO Box 4115 Olympia 98504-3115	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	carol.jolly@ofm.wa.gov		
M	Jim Walls	Columbia Pacific Rtd 303 South I Abundum, WA 98520	(360) 533-4648	(360) 532-2217	CJPOC@Techline.com		
* A	MARTIN BEST	EMB - REMEDY SECTION Camp Murray WA 98430	(253) 512-7073	(253) 512-7205	m.best@emh.wa.gov		
	Pat Hamelton	PO Box 189 South Bend, WA 98586	360-875-9337	360-875-9335			
M	Bill Jolly	POB 42668 OLYMPIA, WA 98504-2668	360/902-8641	360/664-0278	B.H.J@PamHs.WA.GOV		
REF	BREAN HATFIELD	PO. Box 40600 Olympia, WA	(360) 786-7804	(360) 742-589	HATFIELD-BR CLEU.WA.GOV		
M	MIKE DANIELS	PO Box 40600 100 W. BROWN ST Olympia, WA 98503	360-249-4222	360-249-3223	m.daniels@Co.Gov - Haber, WA, US		
	Mike D. Daniels	PO. Box 40600 19th Dist State Rep.	(360) 786-7870				

11.							
M	KEVIN RAUKER	PO 3354 RIPPY HARBOR, WA 98250 SURFIDEAL FOUNDATION	(360) 378-2319	(360) 378-2324	WARR@12@ROCKISLAND.COM		
M	BRADY ENGVALL	FRIENDS OF G. HEDON. 3714 PASTER PK. E. HEDON. PHEASANT RIVER LODGE	(360) 268-5518	(360) 268-0677	BRADY@TECHLINE.COM		
	ARTHUR GRUNBAUM	WASH. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCIL (WISC) TECH (FRIENDS OF GH)	(206) 382-8206	(206) 382-8415	OLG@TECHLINE.COM		
M	Don Lauzon	64 LUTZ RD Abundum					
		1 WV 95520	360 533 3137				
X A	Diane Muir	1727 S. Bown #103 Abundum 98520	(360) 533-1623		dmmuir@hotmail.com		
M	PATTY SEAMAN	134 DAMON RD HOBART WA 98550	360-289-8698				
M	Carol Jolly	EXEC. POLICY OFFICE PO Box 4115 Olympia 98504-3115	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	caroljolly@ofm.wa.gov		
M	Jim Walls	Columbia Pacific Rtd 303 South I Abundum, WA 98520	(360) 533-4648	(360) 532-2217	CJW@TECHLINE.COM		
* A	MARTIN BEST	EMB - REMEDY SECTION Camp Murray WA 98430	(253) 512-7073	(253) 512-7205	m.best@emdw.wa.gov		
	Pat Hamelton	PO Box 189 South Bend, WA 98586	360-875-9337	360-875-9335			
M	Bill Jolly	POB 42668 OLYMPIA, WA 98504-2668	360/902-8641	360/664-0278	B.H.J@PamHs.WA.GOV		
REF	BEAN HATFIELD	PO. Box 40600 Olympia, WA	(360) 786-7804	(360) 742-589	HATFIELD-BR CLEU.WA.GOV		
M	MIKE DANIELS	PO Box 40600 100 W. BROWN ST Olympia, WA 98503	360-249-4222	360-249-3223	m.daniels@Co.Gov - Haber, WA, US		
	Mike D. Daniels	PO. Box 40600 19th Dist State Rep.	(360) 786-7870				

26. <i>*A</i> RAUDI BAUGH	SURFIDEA FOUNDATION c. Hwy 105, Union, WA. 98592	360-426-4474		
27. <i>*A</i> JIM NEVA	PORT OF WILKINSON 1225 OCEAN AVE. RAVENS, WA. 98577	360/942-3422 360/942-5865 (FAX)		
28. <i>?</i> (EPA support) OTTO MOOSBURNER	EPA	206-553-5798	206-557-1775	moosburner.otto@epa.mil.epa.gov
29. <i>*O</i> Laura Heath	Shoalwater Bay PO Box 130 Tahlequah, OK 74590	360 267-1204	360 267-2504	
30. <i>*O</i> Mary E. Deed	52 Panshandle Rd LVW Housing Horse Harbor	360/532-5488	360-532-2268	
31. JOHN SIMS	Quinault Indian Nation - Box 189, Tahlequah (98587)	360/276-8215 x 347	360/276-4181	jims@quinault.org
32. STUE WELLS	CTED	360 753 1158		stew@cted.wa.gov
33. MIKE DESIMONE	PACIFIC COUNTY DEPT. COMM. DEV. Pacific International Engineering	360 642-9382	360 642-9387	
34. Cherie Gale		425-921-1704	360-866-7636	chuckag@piora.com
35. Vladimir Shapovalov	Pac. Int. Engineering	425-921-1703		vladimir@piora.com
36. Justine Barton	US EPA	206-553-4974	← Please correct phone # on roster!	
37. Mike Desmonde	PO Box 181 South Bend, 98586	360-875-9356		
38.				
39.				
40.				

Name/org	Address	Phone	Fax	e-mail
Guy Gelfenbaum / USGS		(650) 329-5190		ggelfenbaum@usgs.gov
MIKE DAVIES		360-249 3203		
MARTY BEST	State EMD	(253) 512-7205		m.best@cmd.wa.gov
Otto Mousburner	EPA			

Justine Barton EPA (please correct phone # 206-553-4974)

Steve Babcock
 Planning Branch
 Corps of Engineers
 PO Box 3755
 Seattle, WA 98124-3755
 (206) 764-3651
 FAX (206) 764-4470
 steven.d.babcock@usace.army.mil

Chuck Gall Pacific International Engineering
 FAX 360-867-1058 chuckg@piengr.com

Levi Oman WA Dept. of Transportation 360-705-7477 / 360-705-6833 omanl@wsdot.wa.gov

Therese Swanson Ecology

ARTHUR (R.D.) GRUNBAUM FOGHT, WGT

Mary E Weed, 52 Panhandle Rd, Noyah, WA 98550 - 360-532-5488

DAVID C. MOLENAAR QUINNAUT FISHERIES DIVISION 360-276-8215 x327 dmdenaar@quinnaut.org

Jim Phipps Grays Harbor College 538-4200 538-4244 (fax) → jphips@ghc.ct.edu

Name/Org	Address	Phone	FAX	e-mail
Patrick B. Sine, CTED.				
Gordon White Ecology				
FRED WISE OceanShores				
Bredley Barker Mayor City of Westport				
LeRoy Tipton				
KEVIN PARKER	P.O. Box 1344 7 Harbor 98250	360/533-7945	360/378-2324 FAX	gchamber@techline.com
BRADY ENGVAL				
Steve Kallne			(360) 664-0689	
PATY SEAMAN				
Rob Snow				
Clyde Sayce address OK		FAX 665-6563		
JAMES R. SAYCE, City of Long Beach, P.O. Box 310, Long Beach, WA 98631				jsayce@willapa.org
More - 360-692-4421, FAX - 360-642-8841, [am not receiving materials]				
Carol Jolly			360-586-8380	
Steve Wells → OK				
Ron Larson				
Diane Muir				
Gary Burns	Shoalwater Bay Tribal Env Program PO Box 130, Forkumula 98590	Phone: 360 267 3101	Fax: 360 267 2504	e-mail: burns@techline.com
Bill Jolly → OK				
Jim Walls				
LEE DANKEFF				

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE PARTICIPATION LIST/DATE: Nov. 3rd 1998

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
1. Patrick Bessiere				
2. Carol Jolly				
3. MARTY BEST				
4. BRADY ENGBALL				
5. ALTHOR (P.D.) GRUNGMAN				
6. Bill Jolly				
7. Guy Gelfenbaum				
11. LEE JUNKER				

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
12. Clyde Sayce Pt of Peninsular				
13. Mike Desimon Public Utility				
14. Dale Bessley WEDM ORCFA	P.O. Box 461 ILWACO WA. 97624	360-642-5942	360-642-5454	crabby@zone.com
15. Steve Speiser Shouhwater Bay Tribe	P.O. Box 130 Toke, WA 98590	360-267-1105	360-267-2504	speiser@realinc.com
16. C. Ann Zora DMR	15 Linwood Ln Aberdeen, WA 98520-9449	532-8178	532-5783	Craig_Zora@wading.gov
17. JAMES R. SAYCE City of Long Beach	P.O. Box 310 Long Beach, WA 98631	360-642-4421	360-642-3741	jsayce@willapa-bay.org
18. Rob Snow				
19. OTTO MOSBROWER AS EPA				
20. Jay Stenwig				

done

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
22. David Simpson	1414 Railroad Av Suite 310, 98020 Edmonds, WA	425-921-1705	425-744-1410	dsimpson@piengr.com
23. Vladimir Skupso	-11-	425-921-1703	-11-	Vladimir@piengr.com
24. Harry Hagg	"	425-744-7300	"	harry@piengr.com
25. Mike Daniels	100 W. Greenwood Suite 31 Monroeville, WA 98057	360-249-4222	249-3203	m.daniels@Co.Govt-haber. wa.us.
26. Gordon White				
27. Eddie Parker	Mayor City of Westport			
28. Gordon Lewis	City of Westport			
29. Fred Dinger	City of Deer Harbor			
30. Ron Larson	64 Leutz Rd. Huntsdon 98520	360-533-3133	11 11	

q Jane Layton

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
31. Diane Muir				
32. Mary E. bleed	52 Farband Rd Hogansburg, GA 30850	Home 1-360 532-5466		
33. Justine Burton	Please correct my phone number! (206) 553-4974			
34. Jim Good	COAS 104 Ocean Alameda Blvd Oregon State University Corvallis, OR 97331-5503	541-737-1339	541-737-4042	good@oce.orst.edu
35. Therese Swanson	it's Therese not Theresa			
36. Chuck Gale		360-701-0811	360-867-1058	charliegale@msn.com
37.				
38.				
39.				

November 17, 1998 { Chuck Gale
360-701-0811 chariegale@msn.com
360-867-1058 FAX

Name	FAX	e-mail
Chuck Gale	360 867-1058	
Dary Burns	360 267 2504	burns@techline.com
Patrick Robineau, CTED	FAX 360-753-2950	PatrickB@CTED.WA
Guy Gelfenbaum, USGS	360-329-5790	ggelfenbaum@usgs.gov
Lee Daneker, EPA		
* Steve Keller WOFW	360-664-0689	KALLASMK@DFW.WA
Dary Burns, Shoalwater Bay Tribe	Fax 360 267 2504	burns@techline.com
* ARTHUR GRONBAUM, FOGH, WEC	FAX (206) 382-8415	OLEARYCRK@AOL.COM
* STEVE WELLS, CTED		STEVEW@CTED.WA
BRADY ENGVALL	FX 360 268 5518	BROVSTER@TECHLINE
KEVIN RAIKER	360-378-2324	WATERMAN@ROCKISLAND.CO
JOSH BALDI	206-622-8183	joshbaldi@aol.com
LINA NEVA	360/942-5865	part of wh@wslapa.ba
* BILL JOLLY	360/651-8278	billj@parks.wa.gov
* ROB SPOW	P.O. Box 324, Long Beach, WA 98631	Did not Rec. notes
* CLYDE SAUCE	(665-6563 FAX)	Did not RX NOTES
PAT SEHMAN		
* RON LAUZON	360-533-3133	L.W.V.
GORDON WHITE	(360) 507-6977	6600099 GWH461@ecy
TERRY SWANSON	407-6781-6535	TSWAN@TSLWA461@
STAN FOSTER	206 764 3600	Corps of Engineers
* CAROL JOLLY	360-586-8380	Govs Policy Off
* FRED WINGE	360-289-4188	City of Ocean Shoc
RANDY LEWIS	360-248-0092	cityadm.v@techline.com
BENJAMIN BARKER	" " "	Cityhall@techline.com
* MARY E. WEED	52 Parkhandle Rd. Heyman, WA 98550	
LIM PHIPP	360 538-4299	jphipp@ghc.ctc.edu
DALE BEASLEY	(360) 642-3942	crabby@aone.com
040 MOORBURNER	(206) 553-5798	as shown in previous ed.
CRAIG ZORA	(360) 532-5783	CRAIG.ZORA@WAONA ZORA@OLYNET.COM

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE PARTICIPATION LIST/DATE: 12/1/98

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
1. Bill Tally State Parks	USPRC POB 2668 Olympia, WA 98504	(360) 902-8641	360/664-0278	bill@parks.wa.gov
2. Gordon WHITE		(360) 407-6977	(360)	gwhite461@ecy.wa.gov kwhite@
3. Adventure (G.D.) GRUNDAUN		(206) 382-8206	(206) 382-8445	clenny@ekd aol.com
4. GARY BURNS Squad Leader Boys Tide	PO Box 130 Tidekno, WA 98570	(360) 267-3101	(360) 267 2504	burns@teeline.com
5. Guy Gelfenbaum USGS	345 Middlefield Rd MS 999	(509) 329-5493	(509) 329-5790	ggelfenbaum@ usgs.gov
6. Jim Sayce Long Beach	PO Box 310 Long Beach, WA 98631	(360) 692-4421	692-8841	jsayce@willapa.org
7. John Sims Quinalt Indian Village	PO Box 189 Taholah, WA 98587	(360) 276-8215 ext 347	(360) 276-4181	jsims@quinalt.org
11. Mary Wedel	52 Ranham Rd. Yogaham, 98550	360-532-5498		

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
12. Diane Muir GHLWV	1732 S. Boone #103 Aberdeen 98520	533-1628		dmuir@hotmail.com
13. Kon Lauzon GHLWV	64 Lutz Rd Aberdeen 98520	533-3133		
14. Jim Phillips GHC	1620 E D Smith Aberdeen	535-4200	535-4289	jphillips@jhc.cdc.edu
15. Steve Wells CTED	80 Box 48300 Olympia WA 98504-8300	753-1179		stevew@cted.wa.gov
16. Steve Kucera/Kucera	418 Brunswick Rd Montesano 98563	249-1223	664-0689	kucera@ofw.wa.gov
17. Carol Jolly Govs Policy Office	P.O. Box 43113 Olympia 98504-3113	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	carol.jolly@ofm.wa.gov
18. Mary Best EMD	Bldg 20 Camp Murray WA 98130	(206) 512-7073	(206) 512-7205	m.beste@emd.wa.gov
19. Therese Swanson ECOLOGY	Box 47690 Olympia, WA 98504	(360) 407-6789	(360) 407-6535	TSWAT@ecy.wa.gov
20. Steven Foster	P.O. Box 3755 Seattle WA 98124	(206) 764-3600	(206) 764-4470	Steven.J.Foster@nus.usace. ar7th.mil

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
22. LeRoy Tyson C. H. Chamber of Commerce	506 DuPont St Aberdeen 98520	360-532-1924	533-7945	Chamber@grays-harbor.org
23. Jim Wallis Columbia-Pacific PCAP	303 South "T" Aberdeen, WA 98520	(360) 533-9648	(360) 532-2217	cdpac@olympic.com
24. BRADY ENGLISH FOGH/CRG	3714 OYSTER PL. E 98520 ABERDEEN, WA	(360) 268 5518	(360) 268-0077	BRADYSTER @TECHLINE.COM
25. Pat Hamilton Pacific County Coastal County	PB Box 187 South Bend, WA	360- 875-9337	360- 875-9335	Phamilton @willapaabay.org
26. Fred Hunter Ocean Shores	PO Box 1393 Ocean Shores, WA 98522	360 289-4186	360 289-0376	
27. Randy Lewis Westport	PO Box 505 Westport, WA 98595	360-268-0540	360-268-0921	cityadmn@techline.com
28. Debby Bracke City of Westport	"	"	"	"
29. Chuck Gale Pacific and Energy		360-701-0811	360-867-1058	chuckiegale@msn.com
30. Justine Barton	US EPA	206-553-4974	206-553-1725	Barton.justin@epa.gov

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
31. OTTA MOOSE OVERSEER / EPA	US EPA	206-553-5798	206-553-1775	mooseoverseer.otta@epamail. epa.gov
32.				
33.				
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				
38.				
39.				

COASTAL EROSION TASK FORCE PARTICIPATION LIST/DATE:

December 15

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
1. OTTO MOOSRUER EPA	SAME AS BEFORE	_____	_____	→
2. Patrick Babineu CTED	same as before	_____	_____	→
3. ARTHUR GRUBBUM Toet / WEC	← SAME AS BEFORE	_____	_____	→
4. Jim Phipps GHC	← Same	_____	_____	→
5. Guy Gelfenbaum	Sab	_____	_____	→
6. BRADY ENGLISH	SAME	_____	_____	→
7. Kevin Rucker SULFUR	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Fred Wines OCEAN SHARES	Same	_____	_____	→

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
22. Mary S. Wood L V G-14	52 Portland Rd Hingham, MA 01945	532-5428		
23. Larry Tipton Grays Harbor Chamber/Comm	506 Oakley Heldens 98520	532-1924	533-7945	Chamber@graysbar.org
24. Gary Burns Shoalwater Bay Restoration	P.O. Box 130 Tobeland, WA 98590	267-3101	267-2504	burns@teckline.com
25. KEE DANER, CPA				
26. Therese Swanson ECOL64				
27. Chuck Gale		360-701-0811	360-867-1058	charliegale@msn.com
28. Beilie Brykuz WYOR-City of WESTPORT	P.O. Box 505 Westport, WA 98595	360-268-0131	360 868 0921	cityadmin@teckline.com
29. Randy Lewis, City Administrator Westport	P.O. Box 505 Westport, WA 98595	360 868 0131	360 868 0921	cityadmin@teckline.com
30. Justine Barton		206-553-4974		

Please correct!

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
12. MICE DAVIDS	100 W. BROADWAY SUITE 31 MONTESANO, WA 98563	360-249-4222	360-249-3203	mdavis@co.grays-humboldt.wa.us
13. Clyde Joyce	PO BOX 205 OCEAN PARLOR 98690	360)665-7457	360.665-6563	
14. Steve Kellner	480 UNIVERSITY AVE MONTESANO 98563	(360)249-1223	(360)664-0689	Kellner@co.grays-humboldt.wa.gov
15. Bill Jolly STATE PARKS	PO BOX 42668 OLYMPIA, WA 98504	360/902-8641	360/664-0278	BillJ@PARKS. WA.GOV
16. Carol Jolly Govs Office	POB 43113 Olympia 98504-3113	360-902-0639	360-586-8380	carol.jolly @ofm.wa.gov
17. Chuck Hagen WA Wildlife Emergency Management Division	WA Wildlife Emergency Management Division Chuck Hagen, WDFW 98600-5122	(253)512-7071	(253)512-7207	chagen@dfw.wa.gov
18. Doreen Bessley	PO Box 461 SEACAC, WA 98624	360-642-3792	360-642-5454	cabbey@eene.com
19. Tom Lauzon	64 LAUTZ RD Abundance, WA 98570	360 533 3133	360 533-3133 *51	
21. Diane Muir	1727 S. Buene #103 Aberdeen 98520-7536	(360)533-1628		dmuir@ktmail.com

NAME/REPRESENTING	ADDRESS	WORK PHONE	FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL
31. PALE & EDITH BERSELEY CPCFA	POB 461	360 642-3942	360 642 5454	crabby@aol.com
32. Mike Desimone Pacific County	318 N 50 EAST 2ND Long Beach 90801	360 429 382	360 642 9387	—
33. Steve Foster Corps of Engineers	PO Box 3785 Seattle WA 98114	206 764 3600	206 764 4470	
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				
38.				
39.				

M

Coastal Erosion Task Force Steering Committee Meetings
- January 5th, 12th, 19th, & 28th, 1999.

January 5, 1999 Meeting (Teleconference Call)

Patrick Babineau
Chuck Gale
Art Grunbaum
Berkeley Barker
Therese Swanson
Gordon White
John Sims
Guy Gelfenbaum
Justine Barton
Lee Daneker
Otto Moosburner
Gary Burns
Eliz Magoon
Brady Engvall
Kevin Ranker
Jim Phipps

January 12, 1999 Meeting (DOE, Olympia)

Patrick Babineau
Chuck Gale
Art Grunbaum
Berkeley Barker
Therese Swanson
Gordon White
Justine Barton
Lee Daneker
Otto Moosburner
John Sims
Gary Burns
Eliz Magoon
Guy Gelfenbaum
Brady Engvall
Kevin Ranker

January 19, 1999 Meeting (Teleconference Call)

Gary Burns
Berkeley Barker
Chuck Gale

Art Grunbaum
Patrick Babineau
Therese Swanson
Justin Barton
Otto Moosburner
Lee Daneker
John Sims
Gary Burns
Eliz Magoon
Guy Gelfenbaum
Gordon White
Jim Phipps

January 28, 1999 Meeting (Montesano City Hall)

Eliz Magoon
Patrick Babineau
Chuck Gale
Art Grunbaum
Berkeley Barker
Justine Barton
Otto Moosburner
Lee Daneker
John Sims
Gordon White
Guy Gelfenbaum
Dale Beasley
Brady Engvall

Coastal Erosion Task Force meeting Feb. 25

Name	Agency	Tel.	Fax
Patrick Bobineau	CTED	(360) 586-1239	(360) 753-2950
Gary Burns	Shoalwater Bay Tribe	(360) 267-3101	(360) 267-2504
BRADY ENGVALL	FOGH/CRC	(360) 268-5518	(360) 268-0077
DALE BEASLEY	CRC/FA	(360) 642-3542	(360) 642-5454
Rob Snow	Citizen Rep.	(360) 665-6763	
Jaden Whit	Ecology	407-6977	
JAMES R. SAYCE	City of Long Beach	[360]-642-4421	[360]-642-8841
Therese Swanson	Ecology	360.407.6789	360.407.6535
LISA BENN	PORT OF GRAYS HARBOR	360/533-9501	360/533-9505
Bill Jolly	WA State Parks	360/902-8641	360/664-0278
Clyde Sayce	PORT OF PENINSULA	360/665-9764	360/665-6563
JIM NEVA	PORT OF WILLAPA HARBOR	360/942-3422	360/942-5865
GERALD HEINTZ	PORT OF WILLAPA HARBOR	(360) 942-3422	
Ron Lauzon	LWR	360/533-3133	Some
LeRoy Tipton	G.H. Chamber	532-1424	360-533-4799
Mac McWhorter	Port of Grays Harbor		360-482-2039 = Phone
Carol Jolly	Gov's Policy Office	360 902-0639	360 586-8380
Brent Mahan	Corps of Engineers	206 764-3600	
Steve Wells	CTED	360 753 1198	
Gray Gelfenbaum	USGS	(650) 329-5483	(650) 329-5190
ARMOUR GRUNBERG	FOGH WEC SURFUGAIL	(206) 362-8211	(206) 362-8415
Fred Winge	Ocean Shores	(360) 289-4186	(360) 289-0376
Clay Veltz	Ocean Shores	(360) 289-0404	(360) 289-0376
Justine Barton	EPA	206-553-4974	206-553-1775

OVER 2

Mike Daniels	Grays Harbor County	360-249-4222	FAX
Chuck Gale	Pacific Intl Engineering	360-701-0811	360-249-3222
Breckley Barker	Mayor City of Westport	360-268-0131	360-867-1111
Diane Muir	Grays Harbor League of Women Voters	360-533-1628	